DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 450 UD 012 454

AUTHOR Simon, Alan J.
TITLE Final Report of the Evaluation of the Directed Learning Program of the Hempstead Public Schools, N.Y., During its Second Year, 1970-1971. ESEA Title I.
INSTITUTION Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Hempstead Public Schools, N.Y.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 141p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Class Organization; *Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Diagnosis; *Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Flexible Progression; Mathematics Instruction; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; Student Attitudes; Student Grouping
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program; ESEA Title I Programs; New York City

ABSTRACT

Designed as a comprehensive district-wide elementary education program, the Directed Learning Program, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is meant to encourage learning at an individual rate related to achievement ability rather than to age. The basic for instruction is the home base group in which students are assigned to one teacher, and where most of the school day is spent in order to provide the students with a core of stability. Science, social studies, music, art, and physical education are most often taught in the home base group. Many opportunities are available to bring students from different home base groups together for special science, social studies, music, or art units or projects. Instruction in reading, language arts, spelling, written and oral expression, and mathematics are taught in the learning family, which consists of four or five home base groups with similar achievement levels in these basic skill areas supported by a team of four teachers, four educational aides, and several student teachers. Each family is headed by a Learning Director, who supervises curriculum matters, selection of instructional materials, and coordination of resources, and who helps train teachers and educational assistants. (Author/JM)

ED 063450

FINAL REPORT
OF THE EVALUATION
OF THE

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM

OF THE

HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HEMPSTEAD, N. Y.

DURING ITS SECOND YEAR

1970-1971

E.S.E.A. TITLE I

UD 012454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP.
355 Lexington Avenue/New York, New York 10017/212-490-0197

HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dr. John D. Van Buren, President
Daniel C. Quigley, Vice President
Dr. Richard Pasternak, Vice President
Dr. Greta Rainsford, Treasurer
Dr. Frank M. Kitchell, Secretary
Mrs. Myrtle Crawford, Member

Gilbert Henoch, Esq., Attorney

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE

Norman Scherman, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Lawrence Roder, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Instruction
James T. Beale, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Business

John Rice, Director, State and Federal Programs

EVALUATION STAFF

Principal Investigator:	Alan J. Simon Queens College, CUNY Executive Vice President, Teaching & Learning Research Corp.
Evaluation Consultants:	Dr. Harvey Alpert, Professor of Reading Hofstra University
	Dr. Edsel Erickson, Professor of Sociology Western Michigan University Vice President, Teaching & Learning Research Corp.
	Bev Hamlar, Assistant Director of the Center for Ethnic Studies Teacher's College, Columbia University
	Dr. Claire Newman Professor of Mathematics Education Queens College, CUNY
Research Assistants:	Sandra Brumer Iris Eller Marcia Gelfand Doris E. Harewood Aura Hochman Larry Maltin Michael Martin Doris Moseley Smith Garrett Robinson Carole Simon Yvette Weinsoff
Administrative Assistant:	Jan Leibowitz Teaching & Learning Research Corp.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Teaching & Learning Research Corp. expresses its appreciation for assistance given in the evaluation of the Directed Learning Program to the entire Hempstead Education Community: parents, students, members of the Board of Education, administrative staff, learning directors, teachers, and paraprofessionals, without whose help our task would have been an impossible one.

Special thanks is given to Dr. Lawrence Roder, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, who served as our liaison with the school system, and whose help has made our work more fruitful.

THE DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Hempstead Public Schools	i
	Evaluation Staff	ii
	Acknowledgements	iii
	Table of Contents	iv-v
	List of Tables	vi-vii
I	Introduction	1
	A. Program Description	1
	B. Evaluation Procedures	3
II	Standardized Achievement Tests	5
	A. Introduction	5
	B. Testing Procedures	5
	C. Analysis	6
	1. First Grade	6
	2. Second Grade	7
	3. Third Grade	8
	4. Fourth Grade	10
	5. Fifth Grade	11
	6. Comparison of First Year in DLP and Second Year in DLP	12
	7. Summary	15
III	Reading and Mathematics Program Implementation Procedures	16
	A. Mathematics	16
	B. Reading	16
	Recommendations and Implementation	17
IV	Attitudes Towards the DLP	17
	A. Introduction	26
	B. Evaluation Procedure	26
	C. Administrative Procedure	26
	1. Personnel and Planning	27
	2. Pilot Procedures	27
	3. Analysis	27
	D. Findings	27
	1. Primary Students	28
	2. Intermediate Students	28
	3. Teachers	32
	4. Educational Aides	38
	5. Parents	40
		41

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

6. Administrative Staff 45

V Recommendations 53
A. Mathematics 53
B. Reading 53
C. Interpersonal Relations 54
D. Staff Roles 55
E. Suggestions for 1971-1972 Evaluation 55

APPENDIX A - Letter from Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 56

APPENDIX B - First Mathematics and Reading Evaluations 57

APPENDIX C - Second Mathematics and Reading Evaluations 105

APPENDIX D - Attitudinal Questionnaires 112

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Summary of Standardized Test Scores for a Random Sample of 48 First Grade Students	7
II	Summary of Standardized Test Scores for a Random Sample of 46 Second Grade Students	8
III	Summary of Standardized Test Scores for a Random Sample of 39 Third Grade Students	9
IV	Summary of Standardized Test Scores for a Random Sample of 47 Fourth Grade Students	10
V	Summary of Standardized Test Scores for a Random Sample of 35 Fifth Grade Students	12
VI	Analysis of the Differences Between the Mean Standardized Test Scores for Grades 2, 3 and 4 (Second Year in DLP) vs. Grade 5 (First Year)- Word Knowledge	13
VII	Analysis of the Differences Between the Mean Standardized Test Scores for Grades 2, 3 and 4 (Second Year in DLP) vs. Grade 5 (First Year)- Reading-	14
VIII	Analysis of the Differences Between the Mean Standardized Test Scores for Grades 2, 3 and 4 (Second Year in DLP) vs. Grade 5 (First Year)- Total Mathematics	14
IX	Schools and Families visited by the Mathematics Evaluator - Fall 1970	16
X	Schools and Families visited by the Reading Evaluator - Fall 1970	17
XI	Primary Students' Perceptions: How They Feel Themselves, How They Think Their Classmates Feel, and How They Think Their Teachers Feel.	29

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
XII	How Primary Students Would Want Their Teachers to Change	30
XIII	Primary Students' Perceptions of Classroom Behavior	31
XIV	How Intermediate Students Feel and Think Personally	32
XV	How Intermediate Students Perceive Their Classmates Feelings and Thoughts About the DLP	33
XVI	How Intermediate Students Think Their Teachers Feel	34
XVII	How Intermediate Students Would Want Their Teachers to Change	35-36
XVIII	Intermediate Students' Perceptions of Classroom Behavior	37
XIX	Comparison of Student-Teacher Attitudes: How They Feel Themselves and How They Perceive Other's Feelings	39
XX	Comparison of Parents' and Administrators' Perceptions of How School Philosophy, Curriculum, and Practices Affect Academic Achievement	42
XXI	Parental Views of Educational Goals	43
XXII	Level and Quality of Communication	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Directed Learning program is now nearing the end of its second year in operation on the primary level, and its first year on the intermediate level. Designed as a comprehensive district-wide program, the Directed Learning Program is meant to encourage learning at an individual rate related to achievement ability rather than to age. Thus, classes are multi-aged and learning progress is continuous rather than step by step; children receive individual attention rather than having to slow down or accelerate to meet the needs of a group.

The basic unit for instruction is the home base group in which students are assigned to one teacher, and where most of the school day is spent in order to provide the students with a core of stability. The members of the home base group were selected "...to ensure that each home base group had an equitable distribution of students with varying talents, experiences, interests, and needs." Students were assigned to these heterogeneous units on the basis of such factors as "leadership ability, motivation for learning, chronological age, social and emotional maturity, academic achievement, rate and style of learning, (and) ability to work independently...."* Science, social studies, art, music, and physical education are most often taught in the home base group. Many opportunities are available to bring students from different home base groups together for special science, social studies, music or art units or projects.

Instruction in reading, language arts, spelling, written and oral expression, and mathematics are taught in the learning family. The learning family consists of four or five home base groups with similar achievement levels in these basic skill areas supported by a team of four teachers, four educational aides, and several student teachers. Each family is headed by a Learning Director who supervises curriculum matters, selection of instructional materials, coordination of resources, and who helps to train teachers and educational assistants. Other specialists in the school also work with the educational families. These include reading, art, music, and physical education teachers, in addition to a social worker, psychologist, nurse, a guidance counselor, and speech therapist.

The format of home base groups and their relationship to learning families may differ somewhat from school to school, since the program contains a built-in flexibility. The classroom units are therefore governed by the needs of the individual students involved and by the nature of the subject matter being taught at any given time. Individual teacher strengths are also taken into consideration.

* "A Parent's Guide to the Directed Learning Program"; Hempstead Public Schools, Hempstead, New York, page 3.

The three features novel to this program as opposed to the traditional graded system are then: the flexibility of instructional organization, the individualization of the learning process, and the notion of continuous pupil progress as measured by the mastery of discrete skill levels. It is by dividing learning units into skill levels, that the necessary flexibility is achieved.

Thus, reading skills are divided into fifteen levels ranging from Beginning Readiness to Sixth Reader. The skills rated on these levels include: comprehension, critical and interpretive, locational, oral reading, vocabulary acquisition, word attack, and work study. The sixteen mathematics levels range from Readiness to Above Third, and the skills include: number and numeration, place value, addition and subtraction, multiplication and division, fractions, geometry, measurement, and problem solving.

The report card system was revised in the summer of 1969 to accommodate these innovations. Checks indicate which levels have been completed in reading and mathematics, completion of a skill level involving a minimum of 80% mastery. A code for the student's rate of progress replaced traditional grading systems, and three letters are used to indicate how rapid a student's progress is in relation to his own abilities. This method is intended to discourage competition with peers and stimulate progress in accordance with the individual's potentials.

In addition to the regular report cards issued in January and June, parent-teacher conferences are held in November and April and interim reports and conferences employed as needed or when a student has mastered a new skill level. The employment of skill levels enables pupils to be regrouped for instructional purposes from the home base units within a learning family according to skill needs in reading or math. These instructional units and other types of sub-groupings are employed in response to the requirements of the material being taught and in accordance with student needs. Students are often encouraged to work independently with programmed materials, and the amount of individual attention is thereby maximized.

There are presently 2,450 children involved in the DLP ranging in age from 5 to 11. The children have been assigned to a total of twenty-five learning families in the seven Hempstead elementary schools. This year the number of children involved was extended to those in the fourth and fifth grades. Thus, children in grades one to three constitute the primary learning families, and the fourth and fifth grade children compose the intermediate learning families.

The staff members in the Directed Learning Program include: seven principals, twenty-five learning directors, one hundred and three teachers, and one hundred and three paraprofessional teachers, totalling two hundred and thirty one staff members.

B. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Preliminary discussions were held with the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Dr. Lawrence Roder, to develop an understanding of the purpose, structure, and status of the Directed Learning Program as it entered its second year of operation. From these discussions,which later involved the Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Norman Scherman, and other central office personnel, the focus of Teaching & Learning's evaluation was set. Through testing, interviews, observations, and the use of questionnaires, the following questions were to be answered:

a. To what extent have the pupils in the program shown growth in mathematics and reading?

b. To what extent are the mathematics and reading programs developed by the district for the Directed Learning Program being implemented?

c. To what extent do members of the total Hempstead School Community: parents, students, Board of Education members, administrative personnel, learning directors, teachers and educational assistants have positive attitudes toward the Directed Learning Program?

At the outset one basic concept was agreed upon by both the Hempstead schools and Teaching & Learning Research Corp.:

> That our evaluation, concerned with the three questions listed above, was only a part of the total Directed Learning Program evaluation. Specifically, that the examination conducted by school personnel of countless day to day aspects of school life, such as skill level performance, attendance, budget analysis and so forth, must supplement the data contained in this report. Only then would a comprehensive evaluation be available.

In order to answer the first evaluation question "To what extent have the pupils in the program shown growth in mathematics and reading?", pre- and post-administration of standardized achievement tests were used.

Pre-and post-test summaries, together with comparison of students in the program for only 1 year with those in the program 2 years follow in Chapter II.

In order to answer the second evaluation question, "To what extent are the mathematics and reading programs developed by the district for the Directed Learning Program being implemented", Dr. Harvey Alpert, Professor of Reading at Hofstra University and Dr. Claire Newman, Professor of Mathematics Education at Queens College, CUNY, made visits to randomly selected families in each building during November-December and May (see Appendices B and C). During these visits, observations of actual

teaching, as well as interviews with key personnel, were held.

The first round of visits were intentionally scheduled for the first half of the school year, so that any recommendations made could be implemented during the second half-year. In addition, the tone of the reports was designed to be critical in a constructive fashion. Concern, therefore, of the second visits was to determine the extent to which any recommendations had been implemented. An analysis of these reports follows in Chapter III, and the original pre and post reports are contained in App. B & C.

In order to answer the third evaluation question, "To what extent do members of the total Hempstead School Community: parents, students, Board of Education members, administration personnel, learning directors, teachers and educational assistants have positive attitudes towards the Directed Learning Program? Mr. Bev Hamlar, Assistant Director of the Center for Ethnic Studies, Teacher's College, Columbia University, and his staff, interviewed or administered attitude questionnaires to all relevant parties.

Results of this aspect of the evaluation, categorized according to the nature of the respondent, follow in Chapter IV.

Copies of all questionnaires used in the evaluation can be found in the appendix.

CHAPTER II

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

A. INTRODUCTION

In order to answer the first evaluation question which is concerned with the extent of mathematics and reading achievement during the 1970-1971 school year, an analysis of the Metropolitan and Stanford Achievement tests is presented below. However, the reader must interpret these analyses cautiously and in the context in which they were planned.

Specifically, no standardized test, even the Metropolitan '70, which is the most up-to-date test available, can be said to have perfect or even near perfect content validity for use with the Hempstead DLP. If in fact the DLP is both a continuous progress program and a program which has re-examined, and shuffled certain skills with regard to "grade" placement, then it is extremely unlikely that any instrument not specifically developed for Hempstead could serve to evaluate growth perfectly. It is for this reason that Teaching & Learning offers this evaluation as a supplement to the "in house" evaluation where growth is examined from the perspective of change in skill level as measured by the DLP performance tests.

The statement should not be interpreted to mean that the standardized test data is worthless. Nothing could be further from the truth. These tests, with their national norms, together with such information as is supplied by the New York State Pupil Testing Program is essential to a comprehensive evaluation of academic status and growth. Our caution is, therefore, to use all data and not just to select the one which agrees with any preconceived need.

B. TESTING PROCEDURES

On the recommendation of the District Mathematics and Reading Coordinators, the Stanford Achievement and the Metropolitan '70 Achievement tests respectively, were administered in the fall by either Teaching & Learning or school personnel depending on the individual school's choice.

The sample for this testing was a 10% random selection by family in grades 2-5, as no test was believed appropriate for first grades in the fall.

In each school an area was set aside for the testing and in every case either a learning director, teacher, or educational assistant, familiar to the students, was present and assisted in the testing.

While it was Teaching & Learning's intention to retest, using a parallel form of the pre-test, in the spring, the district decided to do a total school population testing. A further complication arose in the selection of test -- Metropolitan '70 for grades 1-4 and Stanford for grade 5. In order to have compatible grade equivalent figures for analysis of growth, a conversion table prepared by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, the publishers of both

tests, was used. It must be understood, however, that additional caution must now be used in interpreting this growth (see letter from Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Appendix A.)

Pre- and post-test summaries together with comparison of students in the program for only one year with those in the program two years follow.

C. ANALYSIS

The time between the pre-test and the post-test was the equivalent of approximately seven months. In terms of grade equivalents, this time span should result in an average change of approximately 0.7 grade equivalent for any group whose pre-test average was equal to the median of the test standardization group, i.e., for the fourth grade pre-test in October -- Standardization Group 4th Grade mean = approximately 4.1, post-test in May, the mean - approximately 4.8 - change - approximately 0.7.

It must be understood, at this time, that it is Group mean or arithmetic average that we are comparing and not the scores of individual students in the group. To expect all students to be above average and to make one or more months change for each month of school would, if extended to all schools in all cities be contrary to the notion of 4.0 Grade equivalent. It must be remembered that a 4.0 score represents a derivation of the median raw score for the fourth grade at the beginning of the year. By definition 50% of the group is expected to score higher and 50% is expected to score lower according to a testing concept too technical for this discussion.

This digression was necessary, we believe, to point out that if a group's average is equal to the standardization group, it is expected to be 4.1 in October, however, if it is found to be 3.1, then one could not expect 0.7 grade equivalent change from October to May. Rather approximately 0.525 grade equivalent change would result if the same progress as had been noted in the past was present in the fourth year.

It must also be pointed out that grade equivalents are not to be construed as some standard to be met; rather they are relative scores derived for a standardization group which one hopes is representative of the group now being tested.

FIRST GRADE

Table I below summarizes the May testing of the first grades. Because it was felt that a fall testing was inappropriate for a first grade group, all analysis and comments relate to the single spring administration.

TABLE I

Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Scores for a Random Sample of 48 First Grade Students.

	HEMPSTEAD			Metropolitan '70 Standardization Group
Test Topic	Mean Grade Equivalent Score 1	Standard Deviation 2	Percentile Equivalent 3	Median Grade Equivalent Score 4
Word Knowledge	2.155	0.810	74	1.85
Word Analysis	2.063	0.796	80	1.75
Reading	2.039	0.779	74	1.73
Mathematics	2.333	0.986	74	1.80

It is interesting to note that for every sub-test the mean score for the sample was higher than that of the median for the grade. An examination of Column 1 and Column 4 of the table reveals that near the conclusion of their first year in the DLP, this group scored approximately three months in the reading skills and approximately five months in mathematics above the national norm group. Relative standing can be gleaned by examining Column 3, Percentile Equivalent. While an "on level" score would result in a 50 percentile equivalent, the first grade's percentiles range from 74-80.

It would be especially interesting to see how subsequent years in the DLP affect this group who have made such a fine start.

GRADE TWO

Table II below summarizes both the October and May testing for this group.

TABLE II

Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Scores for a Random Sample of 46 Second Grade Students.

		HEMPSTEAD			Metropolitan '70 Standardization Group
Test Topic		Mean Grade Equivalent Score 1	Standard Deviation 2	Percentile Equivalent 3	Median Grade Equivalent Score 4
Word Knowledge	Post	2.957	1.060	64	2.7
	Pre	2.026	0.680	48	2.1
	Diff	0.931			0.6
Word Analysis	Post	2.830	1.010	50	2.8
	Pre	1.900	0.698	34	2.1
	Diff	0.930			0.7
Reading	Post	2.813	0.912	60	2.7
	Pre	1.872	0.562	42	2.1
	Diff	0.941			0.6
Mathematics	Post	3.208	1.069	72	2.7
	Pre	2.203	0.655	52	2.1
	Diff	1.005			0.6

Once again it can be noted that in every subest this group exceded the "expected" grade equivalent of approximately 2.8 for the May testing while beginning the year somewhat below "average" for all tests except mathematics. Growth in all areas was higher than the approximate 0.7 grade equivalent discussed above. This comparison becomes clearest by comparing columns one and four on the table above. Further information is available by examining column three which reports the pre-and post-percentile equivalent. Once again it is clear that while the second grade sample was below the median (although only slightly) for all reading subtests in the fall, the average score was at or above the median on the spring tests.

The "second grade" group has just completed its second year in the DLP. It appears that the efforts of these years were fruitful resulting in average or above average achievement. Once again, a longitudinal evaluation over the next several years would be highly desirable if one wanted to answer the question of how successful is the DLP.

GRADE THREE

Table III below summarizes both the October and May test results for this group.

TABLE III

Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Scores for a Random Sample of 39 Third Grade Students.

		HEMPSTEAD			Metropolitan '70 Standardization Group
Test Topic		Mean Grade Equivalent Score 1	Standard Deviation 2	Percentile Equivalent 3	Median Grade Equivalent Score 4
Word Knowledge	Post	3.451	1.417	46	3.65
	Pre	2.749	0.832	36	3.1
	Diff	0.702			0.55
Reading	Post	3.218	1.374	42	3.45
	Pre	2.649	1.139	26	3.1
	Diff	0.569			0.35
Arith.Comput.	Post	3.759	1.453	48	3.85
	Pre	2.684	0.874	32	3.1
	Diff	1.075			0.75
Arith.Concepts	Post	3.878	1.645	56	3.8
	Pre	2.722	1.013	32	3.1
	Diff	1.156			0.7

This group, having had their first grade introduction to formal education prior to the DLP and their "second grade" in the first year of the DLP were approximately one half year "behind" the average grade equivalent in each test area in the pre-test of October (See columns one and four -- pre-test.) This lower than average pre-test result is also pointed out in the percentile equivalents (column three) which ranges from the 26th to the 36th percentile. However, an examination of the final test results reveal that in all four test areas the growth of the third grade sample exceeded that expected of an average group (columns one and four). An examination of column 3, the percentile equivalents, reinforces one conceptualization of this growth beyond what would have been expected of a group beginning the year below average.

From the data it appears that the second DLP year for this group enabled it to make progress toward the average grade equivalent. Lacking information about end of first grade test results, it is impossible to comment about any trend or change in the learning curve.

It would appear that modifications made to the program for this oldest segment of the Primary learning family over the past two years were successful.

GRADE FOUR

Table IV below summarizes both the October and May test results for this group.

TABLE IV

Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Scores for a Random Sample of 47 Fourth Grade Students.

		HEMPSTEAD			Metropolitan '70 Standardization Group
Test Topic		Mean Grade Equivalent Score 1	Standard Deviation 2	Percentile Equivalent 3	Median Grade Equivalent Score 4
Word Knowledge	Post	4.423	2.073	44	4.7
	Pre	3.804	1.638	42	4.1
	Diff	0.619			0.6
Reading	Post	4.206	1.886	44	4.5
	Pre	3.619	1.754	40	4.1
	Diff	0.507			0.4
Arith.Comput.	Post	5.332	1.707	60	5.0
	Pre	3.625	0.847	30	4.1
	Diff	1.707			0.9
Arith.Concepts	Post	5.083	1.715	52	4.9
	Pre	4.057	1.756	50	4.1
	Diff	1.026			0.8
Arith.Problem Solving	Post	5.020	1.991	52	4.9
	Pre	3.996	1.452	48	4.1
	Diff	1.024			0.8

This "fourth grade" group, while in the DLP for the second year, is assigned to the Intermediate Learning Families which are in their first year of the DLP. An examination of the pre-test scores on Table 4 reveals that except for the "Math Concept" subtest this group scored "below average" (compare Columns 1 & 4) on all subtests. This status is further illustrated by Column 3, percentile equivalents. Nevertheless, in all test areas the fourth grade group made post-pre test differences equal to or greater than "expected" by comparison with the norm group. (Columns 1 & 4). In addition, in all three Math tests the post-test scores were somewhat greater than the post-test "expectancies". (Columns 1 & 4). Once again, this is further illustrated by an examination of Column 3 -- percentile equivalents. In Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension although the growth shown by the group was greater than that of the norm group, the resulting grade equivalents are still somewhat below those shown in Column 4. Changes in relative status as shown by the percentile equivalents in all five areas except for Math Computations were not great and such changes should not be given too much emphasis.

Once again, it must be noted that this group, while beginning at a level somewhat below average, made gains equal to or greater than those expected of a group "on average."

If one considers this in light of the newness of the intermediate families, it becomes an even more positive evaluation. Furthermore, in many school settings the intermediate grades are synonymous with regression in achievement rather than the growth shown here.

GRADE FIVE

The summary of the October and May standardization testing for the fifth grade is presented in Table V on the next page.

This was the first DLP year for this group. In addition, this was the first year of operation for the Intermediate Families. Both of these facts seem relevant for a comprehensive examination of this data. In all five sub-tests the group's October test scores were below the "expected average" by between 5 and 11 months. If this pattern were to have continued we would expect both a reduction in percentile standing and post-pre test difference scores less than those of the standardization group.

This was not the case. In only one of the five tests, reading, did the May status fall below the October (41 to 34) and did the year's growth not equal that of the standardization group (0.433 as opposed to 0.8). In all other cases the retardation was halted or reversed.

TABLE V

Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Scores for a Random Sample of 35 Fifth Grade Students.

		HEMPSTEAD			Metropolitan '70 Standardization Group
Test Topic		Mean Grade Equivalent Score 1	Standard Deviation 2	Percentile Equivalent 3	Median Grade Equivalent Score 4
Word Knowledge	Post	4.976	1.420	36	5.6
	Pre	4.300	1.472	33	5.2
	Diff	0.676			0.4
Reading	Post	4.976	1.538	34	5.9
	Pre	4.553	1.358	41	5.1
	Diff	0.423			0.8
Arith.Comput.	Post	4.760	0.956	20	5.8
	Pre	4.073	0.988	20	5.1
	Diff	0.687			0.7
Arith.Concepts	Post	5.188	1.302	32	5.7
	Pre	4.270	1.620	26	5.1
	Diff	0.918			0.6
Arith.Problem Solving	Post	4.521	1.189	22	5.55
	Pre	4.030	1.086	22	5.1
	Diff	0.491			0.45

COMPARISON OF FIRST YEAR IN DLP AND SECOND YEAR IN DLP

In addition to the summaries of each grade's test performance presented above, additional analyses were conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in the average pre-post test differences between the fifth grade who just finished their first DLP year and that of the 2, 3, and 4 grades just finishing their second DLP year.

It had been hypothesized that such differences would reflect the additional benefits of the DLP over the traditional program.

Regardless of the outcome, results of these comparisons are difficult to interpret. While one can make predictions based on logical expectations, two DLP years are better than one, the unique differences in both age, curriculum and previous academic experience of these two groups may confound any analysis.

Several comments can, however, be made. First, in all cases, except for fifth grade reading, the October to May differences equalled or exceeded the approximate seven month change "expected" of an "on grade level" group. In the case of Total Arithmetic for grades 2, 3, and 4, this difference was approximately 50% higher than expected and for fifth grade Reading only about 62% of what could have been expected for an "average" group. However, in the previous section of this chapter we have already commented that the fifth grade is not an average group and therefore should not have been "expected" to make this growth.

Tables VI, VII, and VIII below present the results of analyses for Word Knowledge, Reading and Math data, respectively.

TABLE VI

Analysis of the Difference between the Mean Standardized Test Scores for Grades 2, 3, and 4 (Second Year in DLP) vs. Grade 5 (First Year).

"t" test for independent samples

Word Knowledge

Group	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation	t
2,3,4	0.775	0.8666	0.1119*
5	0.753	1.0482	

*$t_{.05}$ (132,34) = 1.675

Tables VI and VII (below) reveal that in both the Word Knowledge and Reading tests there were no significant differences at the .05 level between the groups in the DLP for the first year and the groups in the DLP for the second year.

TABLE VII

Reading

Group	Post-Pre Diff Means	Standard Deviation	t
2,3,4	0.7068	0.9972	
			1.2114*
5	0.4352	1.1886	

*$t_{.05}$ (132,34) = 1.675

TABLE VIII

Total Math

Group	Post-Pre Diff Means	Standard Deviation	t
2,3,4	1.1387	1.3264	
			3.4607*
5	0.6888	0.9823	

*$t_{.05}$ (132,34) = 1.675

Table VIII, on the other hand, reports that those groups in the DLP for the second year did show significantly greater average pre-post test differences than that of the first in the DLP on the math subtest.

It must be remembered that these analyses were concerned not with levels of achievement, rather with a comparison of pre-post test differences during the 1970-71 academic year.

In summary, then, while significant differences were found in Math, this was due not to any poor showing by the fifth grade, but rather to an "extra" showing by grades 2, 3, and 4, and while no significant difference was found at the .05 level for reading the data approached significance not because of any "extra" growth on the part of grades 2, 3, and 4, but rather because of the less than 0.7 grade equivalent growth of grade 5.

SUMMARY

Examination of the standardized test data clearly indicates that learning under the DLP has been a highly successful experience. Progress during the seven months from October to May, has been, in almost every skill area and in all grades with the exception of the fifth, greater than that "expected" for groups beginning the year on grade level.

It becomes immediately apparent that something, whether it be the family organization, the multi-age groups, the skill level approach, or a combination of the three has contributed to this success.

CHAPTER III

READING AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

In order to determine the extent to which the Mathematics and Reading program designed for the Directed Learning Program was operative, two series of visits were conducted by Teaching & Learning's curricular consultants, Dr. Claire Newman, Professor of Mathematics Education at Queens College, CUNY, and Dr. Harvey Alpert, Professor of Reading at Hofstra University.

Below is a summary of the procedures followed in the December-January visits, and in the second series of visits which took place in May. In addition, a tabular summary is included, juxtaposing recommendations from the earlier visits alongside the results of the second series of visits in order to indicate the areas in which change has occurred. The texts of the January and May observations are appended in their entirety. (See Appendices B and C.)

PROCEDURES

A. Mathematics

1. First Visits (December-January, 1970)

The following schools and families were visited at least once.

School	Family	Primary	Intermediate
Franklin	C	X	
	E		X
Fulton	B	X	
Jackson	A		X
Jackson Annex	A	X	
Ludlum	C		X
Marshall	A	X	
Prospect	A	X	
Washington	B	X	

In addition, the following school personnel were interviewed:

a. Lucius Williams, Mathematics Coordinator
b. Dr. Lawrence Roder, Assistant Superintendent
c. School principals: Mrs. Rhodes, Messrs. Barese, Jenkins, Picozzi, Pope (by telephone only), Tucker, and Dr. Liotta
d. Learning Directors of each family observed as well as others who were available.

2. Final Visits (May, 1971)

Interviews were conducted with:

a. Lucius Williams
b. Dr. Lawrence Roder
c. Messrs. Jenkins, Picozzi, and Tucker, principals of Jackson, Marshall, and Franklin, respectively.
d. A number of learning directors and teachers.

B. Reading

1. First Visits (December-January, 1970)

The following schools and families were visited:

School	Family	Primary	Intermediate
Fulton	B	X	
Jackson	A		X
Jackson Annex	A	X	
Prospect	A	X	
Ludlum	C		X
Marshall	A	X	
Washington	B	X	
Franklin	E		X

Interviews were conducted with classroom teachers of the above learning families and the District Reading Teachers. Responses were recorded on questionnaires. (See complete report in appendix.)

2. Final Visits (May, 1971)

The following schools were visited: Franklin, Fulton, Jackson, Marshall.

A random sample of learning directors and administrators were selected for interviewing from among the learning families in B.1. above.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

A tabular summary of recommendations from the first visits and subsequent observations from the final round of visits of any implementation or change follows. The summary is given in extract form for purposes of clarity and succinctness. For the full acounts, see the appendix.

MATHEMATICS

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
I. Materials	
A. Insufficient instructional materials are available. ...Each building should house a collection of source materials for teacher use, such as several teacher's editions of student textbooks, professional books dealing with methods and materials, The Arithmetic Teacher, etc.	A. Although it will take several years in the DLP for teachers to accumulate the varied materials which are needed, there is more on hand in many classes than was visible during the first visits.
B. Children's libraries should include approved math-related reading books.	B. Principals have been taking advantage of publisher's consultation services to acquaint teachers with the materials which are available so that they can determine the best ways to fill their pupils' needs. In addition, members of the staff have attended professional meetings where they can learn about the availability of materials. Some intermediate classes still seem to have little in the way of math materials. However, it must be noted again that this is their first year in the program and it will take time for such an accumulation to take place. A list of math-related reading books has been sent to each school by Mr. Williams. It is hoped that individual classroom libraries will begin to include these books.
II. Physical Facilities and Class Organization	
A. In some cases, teachers either were experiencing difficulty in coping with student grouping arrangements or made no attempt to group for instruction at all. Some teachers undoubtedly have a problem accepting the so-called "loss of control" which exists in an open classroom. In some classrooms there is evidence of a considerable amount of interference when groups are working at the same time.	A. It is apparent that many small things have been done to allow for more flexibility in the size of learning groups. ...Where traffic and noise control permit, small groups meet in corridors. In some instances, walls between classrooms have been removed so that two teachers and educational assistants can work with their groups in a variety of ways. In other cases, dividers are being successfully used within a single classroom. The observer was advised that educational assistants will be assigned to families instead of to individual teachers. This, too, should allow for greater flexibility in the size of learning groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
B. ...One must question whether individualization is actually taking place in some classrooms. In one classroom where children were working on levels 10-15, all children were working on the same page of the textbook. In others, the teacher was working with the entire class, using the traditional lecture-question method.	B. The listening stations which are being installed in classrooms provide the opportunity for tailoring the program to the individual student needs and learning styles.
C. Large group instruction is not being used to any extent.	C. Pupils moving into the new school in the Fall will free rooms for centers where large groups can meet. Unfortunately, this is not the case in all schools. Many will still be too crowded to permit such centers to be constructed.
D. Children are learning to be independent, to pick out what they can do, and to pinpoint their own weaknesses. It appears that most first-graders are not ready to be placed with groups of older children or to move away from the self-contained classroom.	D. Some teachers are making use of many sources to collect practice sheets and activity cards which are encased in acetate so that they can be reused. Once a pupil is made aware of a deficiency, he may choose from among various work sheets those which are attractive to him. More and more children are learning to take responsibility for their own learning.
III. Inservice Education	
A. There is a problem in the level placement of students. ...In some cases there is evidence that weak mathematical background on the part of the teacher is a contributing factor. ...There is a need for a more comprehensive orientation for teachers who are to be involved in the DLP for the first time. Special emphasis should be placed upon ways to individualize instruction in mathematics, how to work with groups in the classroom, and techniques designed to make the classroom a mathematics laboratory. Teachers should be given ample opportunity to work with materials themselves so that they better understand how these materials can be used with children. ...There is a need for a continuing inservice program which will give teachers an overview of the entire program in mathematics, etc.	A. Mr. Williams has been working with teachers in schools when his services have been requested. ...A workshop for new teachers is planned for the Fall. It is possible that... Mr. Williams will be given more latitude in offering his services when he deems it desirable to do so. Some learning directors report that they are involved in helping their teachers with their understanding of mathematical concepts as well as the use of materials. At least one learning director is involved in demonstration teaching. It is possible that learning directors could benefit from some assistance with techniques for teaching and helping teachers. ...The Mathematics Laboratory at the Washington School is visited by teachers from various schools who are welcome to come and work with materials themselves. It has been pointed out that teachers who are strong in math have been identified in each school and that these people are being used as resource personnel by those who

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
	need assistance. Intervisitation is taking place within the school district and teachers are visiting other districts as well.
B. It has been pointed out that [The Teacher's Guide] may be restrictive. ...Some teachers feel that items on certain levels are not appropriate for the level.... Tests may not test the depth of understanding a child has of a given concept.	B. No comment noted.
C. There is a need for a continuing inservice education for educational assistants. [They] should meet on a regular basis with teachers to receive specific direction for the work they are to do. Some learning directors and teachers do this, but the procedure is not used in all cases.	C. Educational assistants are meeting on a regular basis to work on some of the skills which they need. ...Efforts are being made to schedule special subjects in such a way that teams will have more common time available for planning and sharing.
D. Diagnosis of student deficiencies is the teacher's responsibility. How the teacher diagnoses the difficulty when test results are poor and how the teacher approaches the problem of remediation is not clear. In some cases, different approaches and materials are used. In some cases, the learning director works with small groups to remediate. In other cases, ...it is the observer's impression that a child working on a particular level works with the same materials regardless of whether or not the level is a new one for him.	D. Teachers still need to learn how to provide a variety of approaches, materials, and methods for remediation. With regard to grouping for instruction, it may be that teachers still need to learn which kinds of things can best be done in large groups, small groups, or individually.

28

READING

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
1. There is a major need to provide materials correlated with the behavioral objectives contained in the level sheet. ...At the present moment, the needs are greater at the intermediate level than at the primary level, but teachers seem to be having difficulty in achieving the goals and expectations of the program. ...Goals and expectations appear to be too closely linked to published basal reading materials.	1. Considerable effort has been made to provide material to correlate with the behavioral objectives outlined on the level sheets. Many of the new materials are self-correcting and to some extent self-instructional, freeing the teacher for greater concentration upon the needs of those children exhibiting problems. There has been a marked improvement in the use of tape recorders, listening centers, and some new video tape equipment. ...The classrooms appear to be busy with many centers of learning operating simultaneously. Children appear to be functioning with greater independence which is reflected in greater knowledge of expectations and ability to initiate a new activity when one has been completed. The intermediate teachers seem to be getting away... from basal readers and there has been an obvious improvement in multi-level materials and an infusion of trade books within the classroom.
2. More careful diagnosis of children is required and an increase in student-initiated activities. This would require the improvement of physical facilities and an improvement in materials. In particular, a vast infusion of new technological devices and the materials that accompany them will be necessary for this to be accomplished.	2. Video tape equipment has already been used with some success this year as teachers have been encouraged to tape themselves in the class during lessons and to observe themselves later so that they may observe their own strengths and weakness. The quantity of video tape equipment is insufficient to be used effectively through all of the schools in the area of teacher improvement.
3. Although the teaching of reading within the families was not below average, teachers are still operating in group-oriented fashion. Although individualization to some extent exists by appropriate and accurate grouping, it does not exist in terms of differentiated assignments and differentiated teaching for each child. This goal cannot be accomplished without a massive in-service training effort. In-service courses should be offered to the resource teachers at a fairly high level in diagnosis and prescription.	3. A number of teachers are utilizing a contractual plan in which they will work, and the methods and materials by which they can accomplish it. This procedure has vastly improved differentiation of instruction and is highly individualized in terms of student needs. The teachers seem much more aware of instructional materials and there appears to be a wider variety of materials being employed within the classrooms. ...There appears to be greater cooperation among students with older students taking the responsibility for assisting younger students. The educational assistants seem to have a better concept of skills instruction and seem to be assisting very effectively with children having problems who require increased instructional

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
	time in review. The groupings within the classroom seem to be moving more toward a concept of skills development rather than difficulty levels. ...Many of the classrooms seem more individualized and less group-oriented than they did in the fall. Reading specialists and learning directors seem to be working effectively with their families in helping with students exhibiting difficulty and in the dissemination of new material. The in-service course for assistants...[seems] to be very effective, and is enthusiastically received by [them]. The primary emphasis of this course appears to be skills-oriented and very pragmatic. For the coming year, an in-service course of all teachers in the DLP is planned. The primary emphasis in this course will be upon diagnosis, and then working in depth with the teachers within the classrooms in the implementation of the diagnostic information.
4. School libraries should be established within each building as soon as space becomes available. The materials which presently are housed in the resource library should be distributed among the schools. In purchasing books for the classooom libraries, it would be advisable to purchase paperback editions that are relatively inexpensive. Since cataloging is too time-consuming and costly with respect to the purchase price of these paperback books, they should simply be distributed to the classrooms for circulation among the students.	4. In accord with the recommendation of last fall, the central library is being decentralized. Each of the schools within the district will receive a portion of those books and a library will be constructed within those schools that do not have one to contain them. This should improve self-selection and unstructured reading so that the goal of reading for pleasure may be attained more effectively. To encourage increased use of the library, a Library Youth Survey has been circulated...to all principals, reading teachers, learning directors, and DLP teachers. This survey provides criteria that will enable the implementation of an effective literature and recreational reading strand as part of the total reading program. The survey itself will point out existing strengths and limitations in this area. Hence, the purpose of the survey was more than to obtain information: it will enable the DLP teachers and responsible administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of this important part of the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
5. The educational assistant program must be continued. The addition of the educational assistant has given a teacher far more flexibility within the class and has allowed far more individualization than would normally have been possible.	5. In the coming year the sixth grade will become a part of the intermediate DLP. Preparation for this has involved visitation of sixth-grade teachers to the DLP and a one-month course planned for June on the procedures and expectations of DLP. Educational assistants for the coming year will be pooled and used through all sixth grades so that no increase in educational assistants will be necessary. This would appear to be an effective utilization of assistants with teachers requesting an assistant from the pool when an activity requires it. Hence, at the beginning of the school year, it would be expected that more educational assistants would be assigned to the primary DLP because of the lack of independence of six-year olds at the beginning of the year.
6. A reading specialist should be present in each school buildling, although some resource teachers now meet this qualification. Not all do. An individual is needed who is aware of the latest materials and methods available, and who will disseminate these to the classroom teachers through the resource teachers. In only one of the schools were any significant innovations seen. It is interesting to note that a trained reading specialist is a resource teacher in that school.	6. Reading specialists and learning directors seem to be working effectively with their families in helping with students exhibiting difficulty and in the dissemination of new material. The reading specialists,in particular, seem to be doing more than just remedial work, consulting within the classrooms and helping to implement innovative programs. In many cases they appear to be effective.
7. The school should consider the introduction of more innovative methods. There is considerable evidence from recently published research studies that methods and materials placing greater stress on learning sound-symbol relationships at the very beginning produces better results than basal materials not supplemented by a strong phonics program. In fact, one school has already instituted such a procedure.	7. Some of the innovative decoding programs observed in the fall are being demonstrated so that all DLP teachers may observe its effectiveness. This should be an extreme aid in transmitting ideas and information on these new decoding techniques to all teachers. It would appear that the direction is to introduce a decoding emphasis program in the primary DLP throughout the district. This observer feels that that would be a major step forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS November - December 1970	IMPLEMENTATION May 1971
8. The intermediate DLP seems more advanced this year than the primary DLP was at a similar time last year. However, greater flexibility is required at the intermediate level than at the primary level. It is absolutely essential that reading be cast into the framework of the content fields. The fusion of reading skill and content fields is one of the primary goals at the intermediate level. All schools, not just some, should include science and/or social studies within the language arts period. This will require considerable training of the teachers since it will be obviously necessary to differentiate assignments within science or social studies on the basis of one's knowledge of a child's level of reading performance.	8. The intermediate DLP has made tremendous progress since the observations last fall with particular improvement noted in integrating the teaching of reading within the content fields. The intermediate teachers seem to be getting away, to some extent, from basal readers and there has been an obvious improvement in multi-level materials and an infusion of trade books within the classroom. Increased individualization, and ...independence of students in initiating and following through in activities were both areas that were weak in last fall's evaluation and which have improved sufficiently to have almost reached the status of strengths in the spring.

It is apparent that a number of significant improvements have been made in the Reading and Mathematics curricula since the first series of observations took place. Both consultants noted important developments made in the crucial areas of individualization of instruction, utilization of materials and educational innovations, as well as inservice training. The fact that so much progress has been made in such a brief span of time is a testimony to the flexibility of the program and to the responsiveness on the part of all concerned in it. It is these qualities which can ultimately determine the success of an experimental program, and it can be expected that this type of progress will continue to mark the Directed Learning Program in future years of operation.

CHAPTER IV

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE DLP

A. INTRODUCTION

An assessment of the third evaluation question regarding parental, student, and staff views and beliefs about the children's educational needs, experiences, and the operation of the DLP was the major focus of this part of the study.This section of the report describes the research design, methodology and evaluation procedure used to assess the level of interpersonal relationships as it relates to the Directed Learning Program. The analysis of the data collected by the evaluation team along with appropriate recommendations for improving the level of interpersonal relations between the school and the community are also included.

The relationship between institutionalized efforts to change social and intellectual functioning through directed learning experiences and the subsequent performance of the students in the program is a critical research issue in education. Only after assessing this relationship can one proceed to other more specific questions, about the efficacy of the total DLP as of various aspects of the program. A picture of what is going on among those who share an interest in the DLP must be presented before any program can be adequately evaluated. The task was anthropological in design -- one of observing, recording, and analyzing what is happening between and among people -- the focus was on the feelings and behavior of the participants in the educational process.

B. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

In an effort to make direct contact with as many persons as possible who are directly or indirectly involved in the DLP in the Hempstead Public School District, the evaluation team of the Teaching & Learning Research Corp. contacted the following personnel to assess the level of interpersonal relations:

a. Members of the Board of Education (5)
b. Superintendent
c. Assistant Superintendent
d. Principals (7)
e. Assistant Principals (2)
f. Learning Directors (13)
g. Reading and Mathematics Coordinators (2)
h. Teachers (65)
i. Educational Assistants (55)
j. Students (1041) -- (604 primary, 437 intermediate)
k. Parents (250)

The general procedure used to assess the level of interpersonal relations within the Hempstead School District called for the use of a questionnaire and/or informal individual or group interviews as well as classroom observations.

These five groups of school and community personnel are subsumed under three sub-headings -- staff and administrative roles, student roles, and parental roles. They are directly and indirectly responsible for the successful transition in the classroom and in the community from the traditional approach to how children are educated to the dynamic programmatic feature fundamental to the DLP.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

1. Personnel and Planning

Five experienced interviewers were obtained to administer the questionnaries developed by the research project director (see appendix). A preliminary planning and orientation meeting was held before data-gathering was to begin. Emphasis in the discussion centered around the administration of student questionnaires, since this data was to be collected from classes of students during the regular school day. (Other groups of respondents filled out their questionnaires individually and returned them to school administrators or to the project office.)

The student procedure was simplified for primary students during the planning meeting. Intermediate students answered the questions in a group, with the interviewer reading the questions aloud. Classrooms from all seven schools in the study were visited in a relatively random way by the interviewers for 30-minute observations during the second week. (Minor problems arose in scheduling caused mainly by difficulties with transportation, some communication gaps, and the flexible nature of the DLP itself.)

2. Pilot Procedure

The student instrument was piloted on the day prior to actual data-gathering using a group of young primary children who were not a part of the study. The procedure was finally altered so that small groups of primary chilren could listen to the questions read by the interviewer and respond by raising their hands or "voting" for the response they agreed with. In order to test as many primary students as possible, each group completed a consecutive part of the questionnaire in keeping with the short attention span common to children of this age undergoing this kind of experience.

3. Analysis

Analysis consisted of a frequency count which was converted to percentage indicating the majority response. Where there was no clear-cut consensus, the full distribution in percentages is reported. Where it is appropriate, responses of selected groups are compared for similarities and differences of perception. In areas of open-ended responses on various instruments, comments were categorized prior to frequency count. These techniques form the basis for the study's findings.

D. FINDINGS

1. Primary Students

Questionnaires sounding student attitudes were administered to 604 primary students. A summary of their responses appears in Tables XI to XIII.

As shown in Table XI (below), the primary students indicated that they tend to have very high regard for the eight variables that are the main values for classroom conduct. For example, in column one of the table, 94% of the students believe that it is good to take part in all classroom activities, 97% feel that they should try hard to do their best, and 99% think that their teachers really want them to learn their school work and learn how to get along with other students. The approximate overall percentage on all items is ninety-three per cent.

Therefore, one of the objectives of education -- to help students acquire a set of values facilitating classroom learning -- seems to have been attained for approximately 93% of the 604 primary students -- only about seven percent of the students do not share the idealized values of classroom decorum. The structure of the DLP, with its emphasis on individualized problems, makes it reasonable to expect that this percentage will be substantially reduced on the basis of the evaluation staff's experience in other school programs. However, it seems as if this program is currently achieving the goal of helping students acquire a set of values that will facilitate classroom learning.

A review of the next column indicates that these students regard their classmates as holding seven of the eight variables in very high esteem. It is clear that students tend to perceive their classmates as having very positive feelings and attitudes about classroom values that they also seem to share themselves. It is significant that 29% of the students disagreed with the variable that learning is fun most of the time for their classmates.

The third column shows a high percentage of agreeableness on most variables as they relate to how students think their teachers feel. 96% think that their teacher would want them to ask for help when they need it. Only 72% think that their teacher would consider it all right to help others with school work except during tests. 83% of the students perceive the teacher as wanting to find out how students feel.

It is apparent that the teachers in the DLP have communicated a sense of concern for the welfare of their students as indicated by the high percentage of agreeableness on all eight variables. This kind of trust and respect can lead to good mental health in the classroom -- another worthy goal of the DLP.

TABLE XI

Primary Students' Perceptions:
How They Feel Themselves, How They Think Their Classmates Feel,
and How They Think Their Teachers Feel.

Variables	Responses -- % of Agreement		
	Personnally	Classmates	Teachers
1. It is good to take part in all classroom activity.	94	73	94
2. My teachers want me to ask for help when I need it.	93	95	96
3. Learning is fun most of the time.	88	60	92
4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	89	80	72
5. You should try hard to do your very best.	97	90	97
6. My teacher really wants me to learn my school work.	99	98	95
7. My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students.	99	96	92
8. The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	86	86	83

It is noteworthy that in Table XII the primary children did not cluster their responses to the ten variables dealing with ways in which they would want their teacher to change. For example, although 46% of the primary children wanted the teacher to let them decide what the class does "a lot more," 35% of them wanted "no change;" 54% of the students wanted the teacher to make them do their work and behave themselves "a lot more," and 29% registered "no change" on this same variable, and so on.

It is interesting to note that some students expressed an interest in making some change on each of the variables; however, a large number of the students were content and indicated that no changes were necessary. It should be noted that the students entered into this aspect of the questionnaire with a great deal of enthusiasm which suggests that they do appreciate the opportunity to share in planning activities and discussing personalities. The fact that there is no strong consensus as to how their teachers should change is, in the opinion of the evaluation staff, a positive mark for the teachers.

TABLE XII

How Primary Students Would Want Their Teachers to Change

Variables	Responses		
	A Lot More %	No Change %	Much Less %
1. Let us decide what the class does.	46	35	19
2. Make us do our work and behave ourselves.	54	29	17
3. Let us know how we are doing.	65	30	5
4. Care more about us.	59	29	12
5. Find out how we feel about school and other things.	57	35	8
6. Trust us by ourselves.	51	32	17
7. Know the subject.	45	55	--
8. Get to know my parents.	65	28	7
9. Give me school work to do at home.	58	24	18
10. Explain our assignments and class work.	46	51	3

As shown in Table XIII (below), the primary students' responses about the behavior of their classmates were loaded heavily on the "always" and "often" scales on all variables except the ones dealing with whether or not the students are well-mannered and tell the teacher how they feel. A collapsing of the "always" and "often" scales on all variables except number five ("take care of themselves when left alone") reveals a high percentage of positive responses to the nature of the classmates' behavior. 81% of the students feel that their classmates are well-mannered, 79% feel that their classmates' like doing school work, and so on.

It is evident from the data that the students are learning how to evaluate classroom behavior in terms of its appropriateness in a classroom setting. It is apparent that classroom decorum is stressed as an important aspect of the students' social development.

TABLE XIII

Primary Students' Perceptions of Classroom Behavior

Variables	Responses		
	Always %	Often %	Almost Never %
1. Are well-mannered.	5	76	--
2. Like doing school work.	32	47	21
3. Help one another with school work.	37	50	--
4. Take part in all classroom activities.	29	57	14
5. Take care of themselves when left to work along.	18	42	40
6. Follow the teacher's directions.	30	64	6
7. Like being together.	36	51	14
8. Work well together.	34	58	8
9. Like the teacher.	60	32	--
10. Like the educational aide who works with the teacher.	60	30	10
11. Tell the teacher how they feel.	35	48	17
12. Disturb the class.	35	59	6

2. Intermediate Students

The responses of the 437 intermediate students to the attitude questionnaire appear below in Tables XIV through XIX.

A review of Table XIV indicates that the intermediate students in the DLP have identified with a pattern of classroom behavior that teachers constantly try to instill in their students. The approximate average percentage of agreeability on the eight variables is eighty-three per cent. The students have indicated that they feel it is good to take part in all classroom activities, ask the teacher for help when they need it, that learning is fun most of the time, that it is all right to help others with school work except during tests, the teacher should try to find out how they feel, and so on.

Given an acknowledgement on the part of the students that these are desirable and worthy classroom values, the DLP teachers should feel a sense of accomplishment that they are well on the way toward sustaining the kind of classroom atmosphere where children can develop academic and social skills.

TABLE XIV

How Intermediate Students Feel and Think Personally

Variables	Responses
	Agree %
1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	89
2. My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	89
3. Learning is fun most of the time.	76
4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	78
5. You should try hard to do your very best.	94
6. My teacher really wants me to learn my school work.	86
7. My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students.	83
8. The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	74

The overall impression from a review of Table XV (below) is that the intermediate students tend to regard their classmates as sharing with teachers those classroom values that enhance the students' opportunity for growth and development. For example, 70% of the intermediate students feel that their classmates think that it is good to take part in all classroom activities, 79% think that their teachers want them to ask for help when they need it, 65% feel that learning is fun most of the time, and 72% indicated that it is all right to help others with school work except during tests. (See the table for the remaining responses.)

Therefore, with peer relationships having such a great impact on the behavior of students within a group, it appears to the members of the evaluation team that the students' high regard for their classmates' values should facilitate the learning process within DLP classes, although a small percentage of the students recorded the "undecided" and "disagree" responses for each of the variables, every opportunity is present for the teachers to capitalize on the impact of peer influence in developing sound attitudes and values in classroom behavior.

TABLE XV

How Intermediate Students Perceive Their Classmates
Feelings and Thoughts About the DLP

Variables	Responses		
	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %
1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	70	15	15
2. My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	79	12	9
3. Learning is fun most of the time.	65	13	22
4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	72	11	17
5. You should try hard to do your very best.	86	7	7
6. My teacher really wants me to learn my school work.	81	12	7
7. My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students.	76	13	11
8. The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	65	18	17

Table XVI (below) reveals that the teachers in the DLP have communicated an idealized set of classroom values to their students. On the average, approximately 82% of the intermediate students feel that their teachers think it is good to take part in all classroom activities and ask for help when it is needed, that learning is fun, that it is all right to help others with school work except during tests, that their teacher really wants them to learn their school work, and so on. There is a 92% approval on the variable on how the teacher feels the student should apply himself daily.

The values of student perceptions of teacher expectations is very important because children tend to respond in ways that significant adults (teachers, parents) expect them to perform. The teachers are in an excellent position to capitalize on the trust and respect that students have indicated they have for their teachers.

TABLE XVI

How Intermediate Students Think Their Teachers Feel

Variables	Responses		
	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %
1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	82	-	-
2. My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	88	-	-
3. Learning is fun most of the time.	80	-	-
4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	71	-	-
5. You should try hard to do your very best.	92	-	-
6. My teacher really wants me to learn my school work.	86	-	-
7. My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students.	86	-	-
8. The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	72	14	14

Table XVII (below) indicates that there is a wide range of variability in response to how the intermediate students would like to see their teachers change. For example, 48% would like to see their teachers let them decide what the class does "a lot more," 17% a little, 23% wanted "no change," 3% a "little less," and 8% "much less." This pattern is represented in the students responses on all ten of the variables relating to teacher change. Although there was no strong consensus on the direction in which the students wanted change, 46% wanted their teachers to make them do their work and behave themselves "a lot more," 55% of the students would like for the teachers to let them know how they are doing "a lot more," and so on.

Students do have a set of feelings that teachers should be aware of inasmuch as their overt behavior may or may not show the students' "real" feelings and attitudes toward learning. It appears that students have a lot that they want to say about how they want to be involved in decision-making processes. The DLP, through small groups as well as individualized conferences with teachers and educational aides, can provide students with an opportunity to share their feelings with other students and adults.

TABLE XVII

How Intermediate Students Would Want
Their Teachers to Change

Variables	Responses				
	A Lot More %	A Little %	No Change %	A Little Less %	Much Less %
1. Let us decide what the class does.	48	18	23	3	8
2. Make us do our work and behave ourselves.	46	15	24	7	8
3. Let us know how we are doing.	55	17	22	3	3
4. Care more about us.	49	19	22	4	6
5. Find out how we feel about school and other things.	50	20	20	4	4
6. Trust us by ourselves.	57	14	18	6	5
7. Know the subject.	47	14	18	6	5

(continued)

TABLE XVII (continued)

Variables	Responses				
	A lot more %	A little %	No Change %	A Little Less %	Much Less %
8. Get to know my parents.	43	19	24	4	9
9. Give me school work to do at home.	28	19	24	4	9
10. Explain our assignments and classwork.	51	17	22	4	6

As seen in the responses of the primary students, the intermediate students also tend to register their responses in the "always" and "often" scales relative to the behavior of their classmates, as shown in Table XVIII. For example, 57% of the students rated their classmates as well-mannered, 53% of them like doing school work, 64% of their classmates help one another with school work, and so on.

It appears that the students feel that the behavior of their classmates is appropriate and acceptable. There was no indication that they are excessively disruptive, discourteous, and disrespectful to their peers or to the adults in the classroom. It is also obvious that the students and teachers have high regard for each other. For a summary of these results, see the next page.

TABLE XVIII

Intermediate Students' Perceptions
of Classroom Behavior

Variables	Responses			
	Always %	Often %	Once in a While %	Almost Never %
1. Are well-mannered.	32	25	23	20
2. Like doing school work.	34	19	23	24
3. Help one another with school work.	40	24	20	16
4. Take part in all classroom activities.	53	24	16	7
5. Take care of themselves when left to work alone.	47	18	19	16
6. Follow the teacher's directions.	55	21	14	10
7. Like being together.	63	19	11	7
8. Work well together.	53	19	16	12
9. Like the teacher.	55	13	16	16
10. Like the educational aide who works with the teacher.	62	15	11	12
11. Tell the teacher how they feel.	42	18	19	21
12. Disturb the class.	40	18	22	20

3. Teachers

An attitude questionnaire was administered to 65 teachers. An analysis of their responses and a comparison of their views with those of their students appears below in Table XIX.

Inspection of the first column in Table XIX indicates that teachers tend to respond that their students think it is good to take part in all classroom activities, asking for help is appropriate, learning is fun, it is all right to help others with school work except during tests, and so on. As can be seen in Table XIX, 92% of the teachers indicated that students felt that it is good to take part in classroom activities. The actual percentage of students who believe this is 89%, which is very close to the teachers' perceptions. This pattern tends to persist, except in the cases of variable three ("Learning is fun most of the time"), and variable seven ("My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students"). The approximate overall percentage is very high when all variables are compared. An analysis of the data reveals that a set of norms for classroom values and attitudes are acceptable to both the teachers and students in the DLP. These values are the backdrop for optimum growth and development in formal and informal settings.

As indicated in the second column of Table XIX, the teachers' perceptions of how their students feel about classroom life were more toward the agreeable rating than the students perceptions on all eight variables. For example, 92% of the teachers felt that their students would agree that it is good to take part in all classroom activities, whereas 70% of the students agreed to this variable. 90% of the teachers and 79% of the students felt that the teacher wants the students to ask for help when they need it, and so on.

Despite the slightly higher ratings on the part of teachers as to how they perceived students' feelings, it seems that both sets of perceptions complement each other. It is to be excected that student perceptions are in an earlier developmental stage. The healthy implication drawn from the data is that the teachers in the DLP have high expectations for their students; Teachers and students appear to have genuine respect for one another as "individuals."

Column three of Table XIX shows that teachers and students tend to hold classroom values and attitudes toward learning in very high regard. Both groups tend to feel that it is good to take part in classroom activities, ask for help when it is needed, that learning is fun, etc.

One would have to conclude from the data that the communication of feelings toward each other is very evident wihhin the DLP. This mutual respect is one more indication that students and teachers share positive values that can sustain an atmosphere conducive to learning in a school environment.

TABLE XIX

Comparison of Student-Teacher Attitudes:
How They Feel Themselves
and How They Perceive Others' Feelings

S=Student response
T=Teacher response

Variables		Responses		
		Students %	Classmates %	Teachers %
1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	S	89	70	82
	T	92	92	90
2. My teachers want me to ask for help when I need it.	S	89	79	88
	T	94	94	97
3. Learning is fun most of the time.	S	76	65	80
	T	68	68	84
4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	S	78	72	71
	T	90	90	85
5. You should try hard to do your very best.	S	94	86	92
	T	96	96	98
6. My teacher really wants me to learn my school work.	S	86	81	86
	T	95	95	98
7. My teacher really wants me to learn how to get along with other students.	S	86	81	86
	T	95	95	98
8. The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	S	74	65	72
	T	80	80	99

4. **Educational Assistants:**

Fifty-five educational assistants responded to the attitude questionnaire. The data indicates that less than half of the assistants (45%) participated in a training program in preparation for their assignment (question one), and a clear majority (73%) affirmed that the pre-service training program provided opportunities for a clear description of their roles as members of the teaching team (question two). In answer to the fourth question, sixty-nine percent (69%) of the educational assistants agreed that enough attention was given to meeting their academic and skill needs and thirty-one percent (31%) expressed feelings to the contrary.

The majority of the educational assistans described their working situations, in response to question five, as fitting the teacher-leader model and expressed a preference for this model over the teacher-dominated and cooperative models as their ultimate ideals, in response to question six.

The models were:

Teacher Dominated Model	Teacher Leader Model	Cooperative Model
-Teacher makes decisions, organizes leaders and plans learning experiences. Tells aide what to do with minimal explanation. -Teacher maintains control of classroom. -Aide assigned menial tasks only.	-Teacher maintains leadership role in subtle but observable ways; willing to communicate knowledge about children and education. Aide is also encouraged to make contributions to the discussion; teacher and aide have mutual respect for each other. Each learns from and teaches the other. Relationship based on mutual understanding and respect for each other's level of competence is present.	-Clear definition of roles related to experience and training, commitment to team effort, deep respect for other's individuality. Accept common role as facilitator of learning. Realization that educational needs of children are best served by a team of people whose knowledge, experience, personalities complement each other's.

76% of the educational assistants chose the teacher-leader model and 85% of the teachers chose the teacher-leader model as the description which best fit their present working situation.

5. Parents

Of the approximately 1,000 parents of children in the DLP who were mailed questionnaires, 250 replied. The results of this survey are summarized in Tables XX and XXI below.

An overwhelming majority (90%) of the parents agreed with school personnel and members of the Board of Education that the DLP is definitely a step in the right direction in answer to question one. Although 55% of the parents indicated that they had adequate opportunities to assist in the development of the DLP, a significant number of parents (45%) had the opposite point of view (question two). Wherein 64% of the parents were satisfied with the way in which activities, problems, and policies of the DLP were communicated to the community, thirty-six percent expressed dissatisfaction (question three). Slightly more than one-half of the parents (54%) who responded to question four on the questionnaire were active participants in the Parent-Teacher Organization, Parent-Teacher Advisory Board, School Board meetings, and scouting.

In reply to question five, the features of the DLP that parents are particularly pleased with are: 1) individualized instruction; 2) small group instruction; 3) extensive use of resource teachers and materials; and, 4) emphasis on academic achievement. Among those aspects of the DLP that met with some disfavor, according to answers to question six, were: 1) poor communication with parents relative to homework and classroom performance and 2) the practice of changing classes. It was interesting to note that 61% of the parents did not report any unfavorable feature of the DLP. The identical percentage of parents rated their child's attitude toward the DLP as favorable in question seven.

As indicated in Table XX, there was surprisingly high agreement between parents and administration with respect to their percentage distribution regarding the attribution of student's academic achievement to factors other than the students' ability. With only three exceptions, a larger percentage of the administration was prepared to attribute the students' lack of success to factors not directly relating to his ability. The three exceptions were: variable eleven ("lack of faith in the value of education"); variable thirteen ("inadequate individualized instruction"); and variable fourteen ("lack of resource materials within the classroom").

Although even here there was close agreement between parents and administrators, it was interesting to note that on variable fifteen, relating to the inadequate training of teachers, that 81% of the administrators saw this as a problem in comparison with 69% of the parents.

Table XX represents percentage responses where "I agree very much" or "I agree some" were indicated.

TABLE XX

Comparison of Parents' and Administrators' Perceptions
Of How School Philosophy, Curriculum, and Practices
Affect Academic Achievement

Variables	Sum of Percentage Agreeing	
	Administrators	Parents
1. Discrimination	63	59
2. Segregation	73	52
3. Parental Neglect	91	43
4. Insensitive school environment	73	71
5. Poverty	68	67
6. Underachievement and parental educational level	59	58
7. Feeling of lack of worth and poor self-image	91	77
8. Lack of cultural resources in home.	73	69
9. Difficult home environment	91	77
10. Lack of student motivation	78	76
11. Lack of faith in the value of education	55	71
12. Poor attendance	96	73
13. Inadequate individualized instruction	68	71
14. Lack of resource materials within the classroom	68	69
15. Improperly trained teachers	81	69
16. Inadequate pre-service and/or in-service training programs	78	57
17. Levels of parental interest in pupil achievement	86	74

As indicated in Table XXI, parents of students in the DLP subscribe to the same educational goals that are in consonance with those of the Continuous Progress and Directed Learning Program philosophy. In as much as the student role is essentially a developmental one -- a process of "becoming" -- many of these goals should permeate all aspects of the learning experiences. The evaluation studies should provide baseline data for future longitudinal evaluations. The analysis of the data makes it clear that parents have high educational expectations and aspirations for their children.

TABLE XXI

Parental Views of Educational Goals

Variables	Responses
	Agree %
1. Every child should be reading on grade level or above, and efforts must be made to raise achievement levels in all other disciplines.	88
2. Every child should be given a good foundation in the basic fundamentals.	99
3. Minority groups should be included in textbooks and their contributions to American life and culture properly depicted.	84
4. The child should be prepared for a good job and provided with skills that will enable him to climb the social ladder.	84
5. Discipline and standards of behavior are equally as important as academic achievement.	94
6. Teachers, educational aides, learning directors, and principals should take an active interest in community affairs and come to PTA meetings.	95
7. The community should be more involved in educational planning and programs affecting the schools.	93
8. The school should maintain an "open door" policy so that parents can visit with teachers, principals and others in charge of educational programs.	95
9. Parents should be given an "action step" (one thing they can do at home) when talking with school officials about a student's progress.	90

TABLE XXI (continued)

Parental Views of Educational Goals

Variables	Responses
	Agree %
10. Parents should be involved with school personnel in planning a smooth transition into the Directed Learning Program for their children who are now in the upper grades in the Hempstead Public School System.	81
11. The school curriculum should reflect news stories about the students' community.	92

6. Administrative Staff

A total of twenty-three replies came from the administrative staff, including the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, principals, and Learning Directors. Following each question from the attitude survey, responses are listed in descending order of incidence. Where appropriate, the evaluator's comments are included.

Question 1: What role did the community play in initiating and implementing the Directed Learning Program in the Hempstead School District?

Responses: A. Community was dissatisfied with the traditional program -- standardized testing indicated below grade level achievement when compared with national norms.

Community listened to idea, gave it support when it was proposed and supported the budget increase that was necessary to implement this program.

B. Community was consulted and asked for opinions. Different groups met with superintendent and his assistant to discuss learning problems and the need for a different type of program to increase achievement levels.

C. Parent volunteers were used and mothers from the community were hired as assistants in classrooms. Some parents served on the report card committee.

D. Results evident thus far. Enthusiasm toward academic and social growth of their children on the part of parents.

E. Very little.

F. A stated fact -- no choice given to the community.

G. Don't know.

Question 2: List the specific efforts on the part of your office to create a bond of trust between the community and the school.

Responses: Respondents listed formal and informal methods of creating bonds with the community.

A. Formal Methods
   1. Orientation program for parents (No follow-up suggested in any form.)
   2. P.T.A. presentations
   3. Concepts demonstrated by students
   4. Distribution of printed material, explanations, progress reports and future plans

B. Informal Methods
   1. Open house
   2. Teas and coffee hours
   3. Telephone contacts

Comment: Indications are that a definitive plan for gaining the participation of the community is lacking.

Suggestion: Employing contacts that go from the personal to the impersonal and back to the personal. Using people from the community to contact people in the community, especially for initial contacts. Follow-up could be done by phone. This plan should be uniformly implemented throughout the district.

Suggestion: Involvement of other institutions in school affairs; e.g., civic groups and churches.

Parents (as well as most citizenry) more often than not want to be involved with the policy-making programs of the institutions that play a great role in determining the character and quality of their community, and more importantly, the education of their children. In the past, however, their inquiries have been rebuffed by the institutions which felt their professional autonomy was being threatened. Because of historical inadequacies in community-education relationships, it is suggested that the schools make more of an effort to reach out into the community and establish a stronger working relationship. This relationship must and should extend beyond the "faithful" who attend school functions regularly. This often gives school administrators a false picture that all is going well when, in fact, a fire may smoulder underneath.

Question 3: What special provisions have been made for teachers who are not as confident of their classroom effectiveness in an open classroom as opposed to the traditional classroom setting?

Responses:
A. Regular meetings held
B. Problems discussed
C. Information and technique sharing
D. Demonstration workshops
E. Interclassroom visitation and observations suggested
F. Children with special problems given individual attention
G. No response

Question 4: Describe briefly how the design of the organization flow-chart has changed with the implementation of the DLP innovation.

Responses:
A. No response
B. No change except for the addition of Learning Director
C. Principal-Learning Director-Teacher instead of Principal-Teacher

1. Relating to principal on a direct basis has caused problems.
2. Relating to principal on a direct basis has not caused problems.

D. More freedom for student to progress at own, but steady, pace. Grouping according to chronological age.
E. Change from secondary family to early-late-intermediate. Next year: Early-late primary to early intermediate and late intermediate.
F. Rotation of educational assistants from class to class.

Comments: The general response in B above indicated a lack of communication or the inability of the teacher to see things from an overall viewpoint or a different perspective.

Indications: Addition of more administrative personnel but no change in attitude or teaching methods. Perhaps the family is functioning as individuals rather than as a team trying to achieve specific goals. Are objective procedures specifically and pragmatically defined? Is this a future goal? Are team energies effectively applied to the attainment of these goals or are they dissipated in individualized action, application and attitudes?

Haziness in definition of responsibility indicated -- chain-of-command references.

Indications of resentment at interjection of learning director between principal and teacher. References made to quasi-authority of learning director and haziness as to the limitations of the learning director's power.

Question 5: Describe the role definition of the following individuals within the context of the DLP (nature of responsibilities).

Responses: A. Superintendent
1. No response
2. Seeing that the program is implemented uniformly throughout the system, i.e., overall change.
a. Public relations
b. Financial responsibility
c. Establishing educational philosophy of program
d. Interprets advantages and disadvantages of program
e. Instruction of principals
f. Collective and organizational leadership invested in superintendent

B. Principal
1. Instructional leadership
a. Provides educational climate -- faculty standards -- morale, curriculum planning and implementation
b. Makes sure learning is taking place and evaluates it.

2. Public relations
3. Interprets guidelines and adapts procedures in line with philosophy of the program.
   a. Frank discussions with staff and parents in an attempt to achieve understanding of the program
   b. Coordinates program from primary through continuation into middle school level
4. Main building head, autonomy given by superintendent

C. Assistant Principal
1. None in the building or no response
2. Assists principal in carrying out his role
3. Receives delegated responsibility from the principal
   a. Discipline
   b. Attendance matters
4. Very little to do with DLP

D. Learning Director
1. Provides instructional leadership in curriculum development, implementation and evaluation
   a. Mirrors job of principal, only on a smaller scale
2. Heart of DLP
   a. Liaison between Administration-faculty and community
3. Referral to printed job descriptions of duties and responsibilities from the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction's Office.
4. Titular head of Family
   a. Assists in diagnosing weaknesses of individuals
   b. To teach -- training (in-service) of paraprofessional staff
   c. Knowledge of all children in the family; employed over several years to establish programs to meet individual as well as group needs.

E. Classroom Teacher
1. Person most responsible for implementing program
   a. Organizes program for individual needs as well for class needs.
   b. Responsible for student attitudes, behavior and self-confidence. Also, enrichment activities -- developmental skills, learning situations, student progress evaluation.
2. Decides when learning is best in small groups
   a. Teaching: social studies, science, reading, and mathematics
3. Prescribes individualized instruction
   a. Assists learning rather than be the focus of it

F. Educational Assistant
1. Clerical and housekeeping duties, correcting tests, procurement and preparation of instructional material
   a. Variety of classroom tasks
   b. Referral to thirty-one duties listed
2. Conducts training sessions
3. Assists teacher
   a. Works closely under guidance of teacher

G. Reading and H. Mathematics Coordinator (Most people put them together by indicating "same as above")

1. None or no response
2. Resource person
   a. Finding new material for the program; assisting, advising and suggesting methods of improvement
   b. Working with principal to achieve goals and make proper adaptations in the resource area
   c. Provides curriculum levels and competency tests, assists in curriculum development
3. Observation
   a. Responsible to all teachers in the school
   b. Tone setting

Degree of Role Change: (NC=No Change; MC=Moderate Change; DC=Decided Change)

A. Superintendent
   1. NC-75%
   2. MC-25%
   3. DC-0%

B. Principal
   1. NC-33%
   2. MC-42%
   3. DC-25%

C. Assistant Principal
   1. NC-71%
   2. MC-29%
   3. DC-0%

D. Learning Director
   1. NC-9%
   2. MC-36%
   3. DC-55%

E. Classroom Teacher
   1. NC-10%
   2. MC-45%
   3. DC-45%

F. Educational Assistant
   1. NC-18%
   2. MC-46%
   3. DC-36%

G. Reading Coordinator
   1. NC-36%
   2. MC-36%
   3. DC-28%

H. Mathematics Coordinator
   1. NC-30%
   2. MC-30%
   3. DC-40%

Comment: Observations indicate: 1. Lack of internalization of roles and duties
2. Vagueness of roles -- many answers too pat, glib, almost cliches.

Question 6: Are the role definitions and job descriptions uniform throughout the DLP?

Responses: 1. Role definition uniform, implementation varies
2. Through regular meetings with Superintendent of Schools goals have been set and responsibilities clearly stated.

Comment: Indication that functions of learning director and related specialists are not uniformly determined throughout the system. Functions of learning director are dependent upon interpretation of his functions by principal and availabe resources. Roles differ because of experience of learning director and strengths, special skills or talents of participants. District policy states role in uniform terms -- interpretations in light of personnel differ.

80% of the Administrators replied "yes" to the question, 20% "no." 78% replied that uniformity is a stated goal of the DLP, and 22% that it is not.

Question 7: Who is directly accountable for the quality of the learning experiences in the DLP. Please list in order of responsibility for the task.

Responses:

A. Teacher
   1. Major-43%
   2. Secondary-14%
   3. Minor-43%

B. Principal
   1. Major-50%
   2. Secondary-18%
   3. Minor-32%

C. Learning Director
   1. Major-10%
   2. Secondary-70%
   3. Minor-20%

Question 8: Do the individuals have the authority and access to the necessary resources (consultants, classroom paraphernalia) to maximize learning-teaching experiences?

Responses: Yes-86% No-14%

Question 9: Please comment briefly on how you perceive the involvement of the paraprofessional in the learning-teaching process in the Hempstead School District.

Responses: A. Ability and potential of the aide
   1. Reinforces and reviews concepts of teacher
   2. Tutoring -- some clerical duties
   3. Dependent upon teacher direction
   4. Invaluable when properly trained -- some function as well as the teacher
   5. Many aides have enrolled in college courses
   6. Increase with experience. Some teachers underestimate ability of aides.
   7. Relationship between aide and teacher is on individual basis. No uniform approach has been determined--indications are some teachers give too much responsibility, others give it too sparingly. Depends on skills of individual--typing, artistic creativity, etc.

8. Many more than qualified
9. Some assistants are going to become teachers.

B. Training Program
   1. More training sessions with reading, mathematics, audio-visual equipment techniques, audio-visual training needed.
   2. Great need for an on-going one (all year around)
   3. Fair. Learning through experience mostly
   4. Lack of time for proper training--more training needed
   5. Training done by teacher or learning director.
   6. Opportunities offered for college credits
   7. Should be trained so that they could eventually become assistant teacher
   8. Some have on-going program with principal, workshops, one-to-one training relationship with learning and resource consultants.

C. Teacher-Aide Relationship
   1. Function well together
   2. Mutual respect
   3. Roles defined

1. Teacher in charge, aide to follow direction of teacher, never in a teaching situation, supportive role.
2. They should work as a team.
3. Complementary functions
4. Flexibility -- i.e., ability to function with more than one teacher
5. Teachers feel they are another "right arm," enriches the teacher's direction
6. Working together for same goal, better education for student
7. Some tension exists, this is not to be denied, but in most cases, the attitude of cooperation prevails with mutual respect.
8. Where there is complete acceptance, they work exceptionally well together. Some aides are afraid to initiate interaction with a child without further teacher direction because the teacher will not relinquish control.
9. Most aides are made to feel that the teacher's wishes in the classroom are not to be questioned and should be followed.

Question 10: How would you rate the level and quality of communication between yourself and the following individuals?

Responses: See Table XXII

TABLE XXII

Level and Quality of Communication

	Excellent %	Good %	Poor %	No Opportunity %
A. Classroom Teacher	39	57	4	–
B. Educational Assistant	43	52	4	-
C. Learning Directors	53	42	5	-
D. Principals	62	33	4	-
E. Members of Board of Education	-	26	13	60
F. Community in General	18	45	22	14
G. Parents	22	74	4	-
H. Curriculum Coordinator:				
1. Reading	43	48	9	-
2. Mathematics	36	50	14	-

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The most important recommendation that can be made as a result of Teaching & Learning's evaluation is to continue the Directed Learning Program, extending it to the sixth grade as planned. The overwhelning evidence points to the significant success of the program.

In an attempt to improve the Directed Learning Program for the coming year, the following recommendations are made:

A. MATHEMATICS

1. Intermediate classes should continue to accumulate math materials and individual classroom libraries should begin to stock the math-related reading books recommended by the Mathematics Coordinator.

2. It is hoped that the Mathematics Coordinator will be given increased latitude in offering his services when he deems it desirable.

3. It would be desirable to assist learning directors in acquiring techniques to teach and help teachers.

4. Teachers still need to learn how to provide a variety of approaches, materials, and methods for remediation.

5. Not only is it highly important that each building house source materials for teachers, but provision should also be made for space where teachers can come together to consult and use them. Time should be set aside when teachers can work uninterrupted by their pupils and immediate teaching responsibilities.

6. The role of specialists in curriculum planning, diagnosis, and prescription should receive continued investigation and implementation.

B. READING

1. The introduction of a decoding emphasis program in the primary DLP throughout the district seems to be a major step forward and should be continued.

2. The quantity of video tape equipment is insufficient to be used effectively through all of the schools in the area of teacher improvement and should therefore be enlarged.

3. Communication with respect to specific children could be improved and there should be a greater attempt to duplicate records so that the home base teacher and the teacher instructing a child in reading can have full information on the child's progress.

4. Continue change to the use of content area reading material for the Intermediate Families.

5. Continue inservice education for teachers and teacher's assistants.

6. Continue adding to each building's library.

7. Expand use of innovative programs.

8. Continue efforts towards a true individualization of instruction.

C. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

1. Detailed arrangements should be made to provide means by which teachers, parents and educational assistants can provide feedback to learning directors, principals and home base teachers during the developmental stages of the DLP, especially in reference to:

a. teaching innovations
b. discipline
c. features peculiar to the DLP
d. teaching and learning styles
e. environmental features of school and home
f. administrator-teacher relationships
g. other areas of mutual interest

2. Administrators and teachers should develop orientation sessions for new parents and students who transfer into the DLP from other systems.

3. Provisions must be intensified to encourage more teachers to gain new insight into why and how students can improve in their academic skills, self-concept and socialization through personalized instruction.

4. It is imperative that parents become more involved in the educational program as resource people who have significant inputs, especially in the areas of curriculum, reporting to parents, and sub-group life-styles.

5. Parents should receive more assistance from the school in ways to support the child academically and socially in the home setting.

6. The DLP must exert every effort through program design, staffing, and prescribed learning experiences to "compensate" for any negative influences that may impede the progress, growth, and development of students in the DLP. The range is from empty stomachs and special problems of emotional-personality development to inappropriate learning experiences for a particular student.

7. There is clear evidence that all forms of communication among school and community personnel should be increased, deepened and kept constant to facilitate the improvement of all aspects of the DLP.

8. Considerations should be given to developing and administering year-end evaluation instruments that are more in line with the goals and objectives of the DLP. This should be done with a view toward replacing the current standardized achievement scales.

D. STAFF ROLES

A major innovation in the DLP is the addition of the learning director. This change has brought with it a need for role definition for both the learning director and principal, as well as additional clarity in the line of responsibility regarding supervision between educational assistant, teacher, learning director and principal. It is believed that if the learning director is to serve as a resource person, then perhaps, he should not be given supervisory responsibility.

Secondly, to improve communication, and to ensure an optional situation, it is suggested that each principal become an ex officio member of all learning families in his building, assuming some of the administrative and all of the supervisory functions necessary.

E. SUGGESTIONS FOR 1971-1972 EVALUATION

1. Continue the evaluation of the same subjects to gain a longitudinal view of the DLP Program through the grades.

2. Use of the Metropolitan '70 Reading and Mathematics Achievement Tests for all grades on a Pre-post basis (October and May).

3. Schedule school level meetings with the evaluation team to gather informal information concerning parental involvement and perception about the DLP.

4. Extend the use of the reading and math consultants to evaluate inservice education as well as the specific content of the programs.

5. Extend the evaluation of classroom analyses, focusing on skill diagnosis and prescription and general implementation of a continuous progress program.

APPENDIX A

Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

757 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017 TELEPHONE 572-5000 CABLE: HARBRACE

TEST DEPARTMENT

June 11, 1971

Mr. Alan J. Simon
Executive Vice-President
Teaching & Learning
355 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Simon:

This is in reply to your letter regarding your use of Metropolitan and Stanford Achievement Tests within the same project. We have already sent to you tables of equivalent scores for these two tests. These tables allow you to translate scores from one test series into corresponding scores on the other series. Such translated scores must be interpreted with caution. Almost certainly you will not obtain as precise estimates of growth using these tables as if you had used the same test series for both pre- and post- testing.

Sincerely,

TPH/bnp

Thomas P. Hogan
Editor

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF THE DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM(DLP) IN THE HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS AT THE PRIMARY AND INTERMEDIATE LEVELS

MATHEMATICS

Certain questions were raised at the outset by the nature of the program itself as well as by the procedures, suggestions to teachers, and attitudes and appreciations set forth in the Teachers Guide to Elementary School Mathematics (K-5). These questions, for which the observer sought answers, included:

1. Are there sufficient and varied instructional materials and media to carry out the program as established? Are the teachers sufficiently able to choose and utilize such materials?

2. To what extent are teachers familiar with the mathematics which enables them to implement, supplement, and enrich the program?

3. To what extent are teachers able to diagnose deficiencies and to group for remediation?

4. To what extent are teachers able to manage the individualization which results from the multi-level approach to learning?

5. What are some of the implications of the DLP for the inservice training of teachers?

6. Is there a significant difference in teaching style and classroom organization between DLP classes and the traditional self-contained elementary school classroom?

7. Does the fact that the program's goals are defined in behavioral terms tend to stress proficiency in computation at the expense of understanding of concepts?

8. Are teachers taking advantage of the family structure by using large group instruction at appropriate times, thus permitting small group instruction to take place at these times?

9. What are the major difficulties being encountered?

10. What are some of the outstanding features?

Procedure

1. The observer visited each school at least once.

2. The following people were interviewed:

   a. Lucius Williams, Mathematics Coordinator;

   b. Lawrence Roder, Assistant Superintendent;

   c. School principals: Mrs. Rhodes, Messrs. Barese, Jenkins, Picozzi, Pope (available by telephone only), Tucker, Dr. Liotta;

   d. Learning Directors of each family which was observed as well as others who were available.

3. Mathematics classes were observed according to the following schedule:

School	Family	Primary(P) or Intermediate(I)	
Franklin	C	X	
	E		X
Fulton	B	X	
Jackson	A		X
Jackson Annex	A	X	
Ludlum	C		X
Marshall	A	X	
Prospect	A	X	
Washington	B	X	

Findings

1. The teachers appeared dedicated, friendly, and cooperative. Many indicate that they are spending much more time in preparation than they did in a traditional program.

2. In some cases, teachers either were experiencing difficulty in coping with student grouping arrangements or made no attempt to group for instruction at all. Some teachers undoubtedly have a problem accepting the so-called "loss of control" which exists in an open classroom. In some classrooms there is evidence of a considerable amount of interference when groups are working at the same time.
3. There are a number of teachers who have mastered ways of individualizing the program for their students. In the classrooms of such teachers, one finds math stations where children can work on their own viewing filmstrips or other materials.There is also much in the way of supplementary materials which children can be assigned or select according to their own needs. However, one must question whether individualization is actually taking place in some classrooms. In one classroom where children were working on levels 10-15, all children were working on the same page of the textbook. In others, the teacher was working with the entire class, using the traditional lecture--question method.
4. Children are learning to be independent, to pick out what they can do, and to pinpoint their own weaknesses. It appears that most first-graders are not ready to be placed with groups of older children or to move away from the self-contained classroom.
5. Insufficient instructional materials and media are available. Some contributing factors are:
    a. Materials which were ordered were delayed by the late school budget approval.
    b. Funds allocated for materials are insufficient. (This was cited as a reason for not replacing graded textbooks.)
    c. Many teachers are not willing to spend time making their own materials.
    d. Many teachers who are not knowledgeable about the use of materials do not know what to order.

e. Primary families have more materials and have ordered based on previous experience with the program; intermediate families will do the same.

6. There is a problem in the level placement of students. Some of this is attributable to forgetting (over the summer, etc.) However, in some cases there is evidence that weak mathematical background on the part of the teacher is a contributing factor.
7. With reference to the Teacher's Guide:
   a. It has been pointed out that it may be restrictive. Broader blocks in different areas might be desirable so that concepts can be considered more in depth and children can be allowed free reign to explore.
   b. Some teachers feel that items on certain levels are not appropriate for the level.
   c. In some cases, teachers do not realize the degree to which a concept should be taught at any given level.
   d. Tests may not test the depth of understanding a child has of a given concept.
   e. Tests should be used with discrimination. Some children demonstrate understanding on a 1:1 basis which is not shown on pencil and paper tests.
   f. Despite the above observations, there are experienced, competent teachers who apparently use the guide as they feel it should be used, working on several levels at the same time and reassigning topics to the levels where they feel they should be.
8. Large group instruction is not being used to any extent. Among the reasons offered:
   a. Large group facilities are not available.
   b. Teachers prefer to work with their own groups.
   c. There are administrative difficulties in scheduling special subjects.

9. Diagnosis of student deficiencies is the teacher's responsibility. How the teacher diagnoses the difficulty when test results are poor and how the teacher approaches the problem of remediation is not clear. In some cases, different approaches and materials are used. In some cases, the learning director works with small groups to remediate. In other cases, however, it is the observer's impression that a child working on a particular level works with the same materials regardless of whether or not the level is a new one for him.

Recommendations

1. There is a need for a more comprehensive orientation for teachers who are to be involved in the DLP for the first time.
   a. Special emphasis should be placed upon ways to individualize instruction in mathematics, how to work with groups in the classroom, and techniques designed to make the classroom a mathematics laboratory.
   b. Teachers should be given ample opportunity to work with materials themselves so that they can better understand how these materials can be used with children.
2. There is a need for a continuing inservice program which will give teachers:
   a. an overview of the entire program in mathematics,
   b. a strong understanding of the spiral approach to teaching and how concepts are examined in greater depth at each level,
   c. the ability to straddle several levels at once,
   d. a deep and thorough understanding of concepts so that they can better:
      i. enrich the program for gifted children,
      ii. diagnose deficiencies when they exist,
      iii. relate mathematical skills to concepts, and
      iv. facilitate the student's investigation of concepts in greater depth.

3. There is a need for a continuing inservice education program for paraprofessionals.
4. Each building should house a collection of source materials for teacher use, such as teacher's editions of student textbooks, professional books dealing with methods and materials, The Arithmetic Teacher, etc.
5. Children's libraries should include approved math-related reading books.
6. Ample time should be set aside for team members to meet and discuss their work and significant examples of children's work. Team members should discuss what they are teaching, how they are teaching it, as well as why they are teaching it. They should share ideas in order (1) to improve instruction throughout the family; (2) to find the best ways to reach individual children; and (3) to adapt the mathematics program to individual needs.
7. Paraprofessionals who are involved in teaching activities should meet on a regular basis with teachers to receive specific direction for the work they are to do. Some learning directors and teachers do this, but the procedure is not used in all cases.
8. There should be a more flexible approach to the deployment of paraprofessionals within the family. For example:
   a. At certain times it might be desirable for all paraprofessionals to work with one teacher or the learning director in preparing materials for all teachers.
   b. One or more paraprofessionals might supervise large groups of children for a film, silent reading, project work, etc., so that teachers can work together or with very small groups of children.

EVALUATION OF THE DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM (DLP)

IN THE HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AT THE PRIMARY AND INTERMEDIATE LEVELS

READING

Procedure

A list of families were selected for a sampling by Teaching and Learning Research Corporation. The families selected by school were:

Fulton School	Family B	(Primary)
Jackson School	Family A	(Intermediate)
Jackson Annex	Family A	(Primary)
Prospect School	Family A	(Primary)
Ludlum School	Family C	(Intermediate)
Marshall School	Family A	(Primary)
Washington School	Family B	(Primary)
Franklin School	Family E	(Intermediate)

Appointments were made to visit each of the foregoing schools for purposes of observing within the family and conducting an evaluation by questionnaire of the teachers. In addition, the resource teacher was interviewed, utilizing a questionnaire similar to that employed for evaluating the opinions of the teachers with some minor modifications specific to their role. Neither the teachers within the families or the resource teachers saw the questionnaire. The inquiry was handled on an informal basis with the evaluator marking the responses on the questionnaire under the appropriate questions. The classroom teachers and resource teachers were encouraged to speak as frankly as possible by informing them that the results of the evaluation would be examined

carefully by the administrative staff. As a result any needs or problems that were consistently mentioned by a large number of their colleagues could result in significant changes. Also, the continuation of DLP in its present form or with modifications or ending the program completely, might very well also be the result of this investigation. Thus, in ascertaining the attitudes of teachers an attempt was made to make them feel that they were being involved in the decision-making process and that any observations of a positive or negative nature which they were willing to share would be included in the report. A most significant aspect of the preliminary discussion with teachers prior to administering the questions from the questionnaire was the information that their responses would be anonymous and would be grouped with the responses of all the other teachers. Therefore, the teacher attitude questionnaire is not reported by school since this would identify the family or the group of teachers in a manner that might have made individual identification possible. The teachers' opinions, by a percentage, will be reported for the total group. The DLP has been in existence at the primary level for over a year. However, the DLP in the intermediate grades was introduced to the Hempstead Public Schools for the first time in September of 1970. Since teacher opinion in the intermediate families was based on such a limited experience with DLP, the results of the opinion questionnaire administered to the intermediate teachers seemed to reflect the teacher's prejudgment of the DLP rather than her actual experience. The body of this report will then contain the results of the teacher opinion questionnaire for primary family teachers, the results of the resource teacher questionnaire, and results of classroom observation of the teaching of reading lessons.

Each school in the sample was contacted in advance and an appointment was made for classroom visitation. These visits were made during the language arts instructional period so that the evaluator would have an opportunity to observe the teaching of reading. The time allotted for evaluation within each classroom varied depending upon the activities observed. Rauch's "Characteristics of a Good Reading Lesson," which has been published in various sources -- most recently in the December, 1970 issue of The Reading Teacher ("How to Evaluate a Reading Program"), was used as a guide. These characteristics are:

1. The teacher has a definite goal or purpose for a lesson and that purpose is evident to students.
2. The lesson is planned, systematic, yet flexible according to dynamics of classroom situation.
3. The classroom atmosphere is a pleasant, attractive and optimistic one.
4. Attention is paid to individual differences.
5. Rapport between teachers and students is evident.
6. The teacher is diagnosing as she is teaching.
7. There is readiness for the lesson.
8. Pupils are motivated.
9. Materials are varied (basals, library books, workbooks, kits, mimeographed materials, etc.).
10. Full use is made of audio-visual aids.
11. Questions are varied to check different levels of comprehension.
12. Material is at appropriate level for students.

13. Teacher is obviously aware of such levels as "Instructional," "independent," and "frustration."

14. Meaningful oral reading activities are used to check comprehension.

15. Pupils have been trained in self-direction (i.e., go from one activity to another without disturbing teacher).

16. All children are productively involved with some aspect of reading.

17. Use is made of classroom and school libraries.

18. There is application of basic reading skills to content areas.

19. Efficient record keeping is done by teacher and students.

20. Teacher has sense of perspective and humor.

21. There is evidence of review and relationship to previously learned material.

22. There are follow-up or enrichment activities.

In each classroom observation a check was made of the number of the twenty-two characteristics observed in that classroom. In reporting the data obtained in the classroom observation, each of these 22 characteristics of a good reading program will be listed with the percentage of classrooms in which a particular characteristic was observed. Examination of the percentages for each of these 22 characteristics will reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the instructional staff in the teaching of reading.

The teacher opinion questionnaire and the resource teacher questionnaire follow:

TEACHER OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your reaction to DLP?

   Favorable____ Favorable with minor reservations____
   Favorable with major reservations____ Unfavorable____.

   a) How many years have you taught prior to instituting the DLP?

2. Do you find the Competency Skills Sheets given by levels

   Very Useful____ Useful with reservations____ a Hindrance____?

3. Do you find the Evaluation Tests to determine progress by level

   Very Useful____ Useful with reservations____ a Hindrance____?

4. How satisfactory is communication among teachers concerning children for whom more than one teacher share responsibilities?

   Good____ Fair____ Poor____.

5. Who bears major responsibility for a child's reading progress?

   Home Base Teacher____ Reading Teacher____ Entire Family____
   Home Base Teacher and Reading Teacher shared____.

6. Is record keeping on each individual child a problem?

   No____ Minor Burden____ Major Burden____.

7. Are physical facilities adequate for DLP?

   Yes____ No____

   a) Would physical facilities be adequate for normal self-contained classroom?

   Yes____ No____

8. Are the materials you have to work with plentiful____
   adequate____ inadequate____?

   a) Do you have sufficient AV material to help individualize instruction?

   Yes____ No____ Improving____

9. Can time be efficiently utilized in DLP?

   Yes____ No____

Teacher Opinion Questionnaire (continued)

10. Is movement from one teacher's classroom to another a problem?

Yes_____ No_____

a) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom heterogeneously grouped to DLP?

Yes_____ No_____

b) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom homogeneously grouped to DLP in which range of individual differences is reduced?

Yes_____ No_____

11. Do you feel children's needs are met better through DLP than through grouping within a self-contained classroom?

Yes_____ No_____

12. Who do you feel benefits most from DLP?

Superior reader_____ Average reader_____ Disadvantaged reader_____

Remedial reader_____ All_____

13. Is preparation time of lessons a problem in DLP?

Yes_____ No_____

a) Do you spend more time preparing in DLP than was required prior to DLP program?

Yes_____ No_____

14. Are the resource teachers helpful?

Yes_____ No_____

15. Are the Educational Aides

Very useful_____ Useful_____ a Hindrance_____?

16. Has multi-age groupings produced any significant problems psychologically or sociologically of which you are aware?

Yes_____ No_____

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE OF RESOURCE TEACHERS

1. What are your functions in the DLP?

   a) supplement teacher in classroom
   b) teach remedial groups during language arts lesson
   c) provide materials and encourage application
   d) help teacher develop lesson plans
   e) help teacher organize class for instruction
   f) evaluation of teacher-competency
   g) test all new children coming in
   h) assist in evaluation of pupil progress
   i) write prescriptions for child having problem
   j) demonstration lessons
   k) demonstrate materials

2. What is your reaction to DLP?

   Favorable____ Favorable with minor reservations_____
   Favorable with major reservations_____ Unfavorable_____.

   a) How many years have you taught prior to instituting the DLP?

3. Do you find the Competency Skills Sheets given by levels

   Very Useful____ Useful with reservations_____ a Hindrance_____?

4. Do you find the Evaluation Tests to determine progress by level

   Very Useful____ Useful with reservations_____ a Hindrance_____?

5. How satisfactory is communication among teachers concerning children for whom more than one teacher share responsibilities?

   Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____.

6. Who bears major responsibility for a child's reading progress?

   Home Base Teacher____ Reading Teacher____ Entire Family_____
   Home Base Teacher and Reading Teacher Shared_____.

7. Is record keeping on each individual child a problem?

   No_____ Minor burden_____ Major burden_____.

8. Are physical facilities adequate for DLP?

   Yes_____ No_____

   a) Would physical facilities be adequate for normal self-contained classroom?

   Yes_____ No_____

Opinion Questionnaire of Resource Teachers (continued)

9. Are the materials you have to work with plentiful_____ adequate_____ inadequate_____?

   a) Do you have sufficient AV material to help individualize instruction?

      Yes_____ No_____ Improving_____

10. Can time be efficiently utilized in DLP?

      Yes_____ No_____

11. Is movement from one teacher's classroom to another a problem?

      Yes_____ No_____

   a) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom heterogeneously grouped to DLP?

      Yes_____ No_____

   b) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom homogeneously grouped to DLP in which range of individual differences is reduced?

      Yes_____ No_____

12. Do you feel children's needs are met better through DLP than through grouping within a self-contained classroom?

      Yes_____ No_____

13. Who do you feel benefits most from DLP?

      Superior reader_____ Average reader_____ Disadvantaged reader_____
      Remedial reader_____ All_____.

14. Are the Educational Aides

      Very useful_____ Useful_____ a Hindrance_____?

15. Has multi-age groupings produced any significant problems psychologically or sociologically of which you are aware?

      Yes_____ No_____

As was described earlier, teachers were encouraged to talk freely concerning their reactions to the DLP. Their responses were recorded and were later tallied by the interviewer into the respective categories under each of the questions. On the interviewer's sheet there was a heading for each of the questions on the questionnaire. As a teacher spoke, her reactions in each of the areas designated by the questions was recorded under the appropriate heading. If a teacher had not responded to certain aspects within the questionnaire, more specific questions were asked to elicit the information. It appeared to the interviewer that teachers spoke frankly although somewhat guardedly at times.

Impressions of the Classrooms

The first thing that struck this observer was the difference among the classrooms in the DLP. Some classes gave an impression of movement, activity and excitement; others had a very structured, organized, controlled atmosphere. This seemed to reflect the attitude of the individual teachers rather than the school administration or the resource teacher. There was generally considerable variation among the classrooms observed in the family. Most of the classes seemed to be organized in a very traditional manner. They generally ranged from two to four groups with perhaps a few children who were in a transitional situation between groups. Individualization in a DLP seems to result more from careful grouping and moving children from one teacher to another than an attempt to work individually with each child on his own needs. For each child within the language arts period of her class, teachers have a record folder which contain level sheets indicating the skills children

have mastered and those in which they are still weak. Children were grouped by levels but there was little attempt made to individualize within the levels.

A majority of the teachers were using basal readers and as a result, there seemed to be little correlation between the skills presented in a lesson and those skills indicated as requiring mastery on the child's level sheet. The classroom contained multi-age groupings and there seemed to be little conflict among the children relating to this factor. The reading groups themselves contained children of mixed ages with no observable difficulties evident from these multi-age combinations.

Generally, I was favorably impressed with the sincerity, warmth and understanding of most of the teachers. They all seemed keenly interested in the children and were attempting to give them the best reading instruction possible. Unfortunately, many of the teachers have not had extensive training in the teaching of reading and this was particularly evident in the tendency to rely upon workbooks and other forms of seat work in addition to the manuals of the basal reading systems. Confidence in the procedures of teaching reading and knowledge of the skills to be taught seemed particularly lacking in many of the intermediate families. Some in-service training is obviously in order in the teaching of reading and in diagnosis of reading difficulties. Although many of the teachers were aware of the child's difficulties and could pin-point them with some degree of exactness from the level sheets, few were able to ascertain any reasons for the child's difficulties in those areas. As a result, any diagnosis which is evident is generally on a rather surface level.

Each classroom contained an educational aide whose utilization was determined by the classroom teacher. Aides were observed in a wide variety of activities; the major ones being: the checking of work, circulating around the classroom, and helping children with their seat work, and occasionally, sitting and working with individual children who were having specific difficulties in given areas. Many of the aides exuded warmth and understanding in their contacts with the pupils and seemed to play an important but secondary role to the teacher. There seemed to be some relationship between the confidence of the teacher and her own ability to deal with the reading program and the degree to which she utilized the aides in practice activities following teaching. With very few exceptions, teachers appreciate the aides and their efforts and feel they are making a notable contribution to the success of their reading program.

The pupils seemed to participate well during the classroom periods and there generally seemed to be keen interest during the reading lessons observed. However, during seat work activities, there seemed to be a sense of restlessness and boredom. This does not mean that the pupils did not participate and carry out the various tasks assigned to them, but I had the impression in some classes that they, as well as their teachers, did not have as clear a sense of the goals and the means for achieving them that should have been present.

Results of the Evaluation of Classroom Performance

The twenty-two (22) statements relating to the characteristics of a good reading lesson are listed in the section entitled, Procedure. The following is a result of the tabulation for each of the characteristics with the percentages rounded to the nearest five (5%) percent for primary and intermediate families:

TABLE I

TABULATION FOR CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD READING LESSON

	Primary Family	Intermediate Family
1.	60%	50%
2.	75%	65%
3.	85%	70%
4.	75%	65%
5.	90%	80%
6.	75%	50%
7.	90%	70%
8.	75%	75%
9.	80%	75%
10.	50%	50%
11.	15%	20%
12.	90%	80%
13.	80%	70%
14.	25%	20%
15.	70%	60%
16.	80%	75%
17.	40%	50%
18.	10%	65%
19.	80%	50%
20.	75%	75%
21.	75%	65%
22.	80%	75%

In analyzing classroom performance from the results described above, there are some notable strengths. First, is the teacher's concern for readiness, especially in the primary families which seems related to the skills sheets by levels which are provided for each child. Teachers seem more aware of the specific skills a child has learned in the past and seems more knowledgeable with respect to general skills sequences. This may seem inconsistent with the relatively poor percentage noted in Question #1, but that percentage requires some explanation. Generally, teachers seem to have a definite goal or purpose in a given lesson, but many teachers were not fulfilling the second aspect of characteristic No. 1 in that they

did not make the purpose evident to the students. In only half of the intermediate families was the child specifically aware of goals and in only sixty (60%) percent of primary families was that true. It might be interesting to provide parallel skill sheets for the children similar to those which the teacher possesses so that a child may check his own proficiencies and observe his own strengths and weaknesses. Since these skill sheets reflect behavioral objectives,students could help judge their own progress. There seems to be generally little student direction in initiating activities or in evaluation of their own progress.

Strength was also evidenced in teacher-student rapport, although there were some isolated instances of teacher-intimidating pupils and vice-versa. The classrooms generally were optimistic and free in terms of teacher-student interaction. The teachers were genuinely concerned about the children and felt strong sense of responsibility concerning the student's progress. Children were allowed to work at their own pace and teachers seemed to feel less pressured. This may very well relate to the Directed Learning Program (DLP). There seemed to be a genuine feeling that flexibility was possible and that children could be shifted if they progressed at a rate different from that of the others in their grouping. Unfortunately, once a child was grouped within a particular classroom, the teacher felt such a strong sense of responsibility that she seemed unwilling to shift that child to another's classroom. Most shifts from one group to another between classrooms and a family seem to be the result of personality conflicts or inability to cope with a specific child's problem rather than a

simple change to another group because of a change in the child's level of performance.

The competency tests and level sheets containing the list of skills (expressed as behavioral objectives) to be mastered at each level obviously produced an awareness of difficulty levels. As a result, 90% of the primary family teachers seem to have children placed in material that was at an appropriate level for their reading performance. The intermediate teachers exhibited less strength in this area.

There were some noteable weaknesses as well in the reading lessons. First, teacher diagnosis seemed more related to the what of the child's errors rather than the why. This was particularly evident in the intermediate families and slightly less evident in the primary families. Audiovisual aids were observed in some classrooms and were being utilized by some teachers. However, there seemed to be a dearth of materials available for these audio-visual aids and they were not being used to their fullest extent. Only 50% of the classrooms observed in the intermediate and primary families were using some form of audiovisual aid. The percentages on Question 11 exhibited another major weakness. There seemed to be better understanding of the word recognition program than of the comprehension program. Comprehension questions were utilized to test the results of a child's decoding. These questions were rarely varied in a manner that would allow the checking of different levels of comprehension. The only cases where some variation was observed was when this was structured in the basal reading manual that the teacher was employing. The application of basic reading skills to content areas was also very weak. Only 10% of the primary families exhibited this application within the reading lesson and 15% of the intermediate families exhibited this necessary

application. Since social studies and science are not taught during the language arts period there seemed to be some reluctance on the part of teachers to employ reading materials from these areas to help effect transfer of reading skills to content. This weakness may be bearable in the primary families, but it is an inexcusable lack in intermediate families. There were a few cases where teachers were intergrating research skills and reading in the social studies or science area in an individualized fashion as part of the reading program in language arts, but this was relatively rare. There were materials employed at the intermediate level where the child performed certain skills in materials of a social studies or science content, but these were not necessarily related to his studies in these areas at other times during the school day.

Most oral reading activities seemed to be a situation of each child reading in turn. There were a few situations where a teacher asked a question and asked a child to find the answer and exhibit this by reading a passage orally. The low percentage for meaningful oral reading activities in the intermediate families is understandable in light of the fact that less oral reading is normally done at the intermediate level. However, in order to diagnose children's difficulties in the word recognition and analysis areas, some oral reading is necessary. The oral reading at the intermediate level seemed no more meaningful than that observed at the primary level where each child read when called upon. The generally lower percentages for the intermediate teachers may reflect less training in the teaching of reading and the newness of the Directed Learning Program.

There are some cases where the percentages are fairly high but are somewhat deceptive. The first is on Question #9 where variation in usage of materials is noted. Although the percentages in this area appear to be

fairly respectable, there seemed to be a tremendous reliance upon basal readers, workbooks and mimeographed materials. There was a general weakness in the area of library books being used instructionally. The libraries within most of the school buildings are very poor and the classroom libraries are relatively weak. This seems related to the fact that teachers do not view the library books as part of the instructional program. On question #2, there is no doubt that for a majority of the teachers the lesson is planned and systematic. However, its flexibility according to the dynamics of the classroom situation was highly variable. The high percentages in this area reflect the fact that there was some systematic planning, but the amount of flexibility within the lesson was generally poor. Had flexibility been considered a major component of characteristic #2, the percentages on this statement would have been below 50%. Another area for concern is on statement #15; the percentage of pupils who have been trained in self-direction is not very high. Although 70% for the primary and 60% for the intermediate seem like satisfactory percentages, the success of an individualized program such as the DLP requires far more training in independent activities than was observed in the classroom. There generally appeared to be too much teacher direction and a minimum of student direction. This is reflected in the low percentage on statement #19 since there was evidence of efficient record keeping done by teachers, but very little of this was engaged in by students.

In general, the Hempstead teachers do exhibit concern with lesson presentation and lesson outcome. The behavioral objectives expressed on the skills levels sheets are undoubtedly helpful in this area. There is still little evidence of differentiated assignments and not much reading on the part of students for their personal use. The teachers attempt to use some variety in materials, but there seem less materials available in the classroom in the Hempstead Public Schools than in many other schools which the evaluator has

visited. The initial groupings for skills instruction in terms of a child's level of performance seem to be carefully and accurately done, and considerable flexibility in re-grouping is possible within the DLP. The number of children who are re-grouped during the year, however, appears to be very small. The major areas of weakness would appear to be in the use of audiovisual materials, interest centers, and variety in technique. Most of the teachers observed develop a skill in a specific structured manner, but seem unable to flexibly utilize other procedures if a child encounters difficulty in learning it from the original presentation. The use of trade books and content materials for instructional purposes seems relatively limited as is the amount of materials available of a self-instructional nature. There is no doubt the children are allowed to progress at their own rate and that more individualization seems to be occurring in the DLP. However, teachers seem hampered by lack of skill in developing differentiated lessons, in diagnosing specific difficulties. An infusion of new materials designed specifically for individualized programs and some in-service courses that would help teachers understand the nature of the reading process is sorely needed. This may develop appropriate techniques for diagnosis in teaching which are more differentiated than presently exist. The composite performance of the teachers as indicated in the above percentages is certainly better than average. However, there was considerable variation among the teachers. The range was rather wide with the highest individual score achieved by a teacher of 92% and a low score of 35%. This wide range in proficiency of teaching reading is not unusual. It was noted that resource teachers seemed to be spending more time in the classroom of those teachers attaining low scores than in the other classrooms, which reflects their awareness of the situation.

TABLE II

TEACHER OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your reaction to DLP?

   Favorable 50% Favorable with minor reservations 30%
   Favorable with major reservations 10% Unfavorable 10% .

   a) How many years have you taught prior to instituting the DLP?

2. Do you find the Competency Skills Sheets given by levels

   Very Useful 20% Useful with reservations 60% a Hindrance 20% ?

3. Do you find the Evaluation Tests to determine progress by level

   Very Useful 10% Useful with reservations 40% a Hindrance 50% ?

4. How satisfactory is communication among teachers concerning children for whom more than one teacher share responsibilities?

   Good 80% Fair 15% Poor 5% .

5. Who bears major responsibility for a child's reading progress?

   Home Base Teacher 10% Reading Teacher 50% Entire Family 0%
   Home Base Teacher and Reading Teacher shared 40% .

6. Is record keeping on each individual child a problem?

   No 30% Minor Burden 50% Major Burden 20% .

7. Are physical facilities adequate for DLP?

   Yes 20% No 80%

   a) Would physical facilities be adequate for normal self-contained classroom?

   Yes 50% No 50%

8. Are the materials you have to work with plentiful 20%
   adequate 20% inadequate 60% ?

   a) Do you have sufficient AV material to help individualize instruction?

   Yes 30% No 30% Improving 40%

9. Can time be efficiently utilized in DLP?

   Yes 75% No 25%

Teacher Opinion Questionnaire (continued)

10. Is movement from one teacher's classroom to another a problem?

Yes 20% No 80%

a) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom heterogeneously grouped to DLP?

Yes 30% No 70%

b) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom homogeneously grouped to DLP in which range of individual differences is reduced?

Yes 50% No 50%

11. Do you feel children's needs are met better through DLP than through grouping within a self-contained classroom?

Yes 70% No 30%

12. Who do you feel benefits most from DLP?

Superior reader 30% Average reader 5% Disadvantaged reader 20%

Remedial reader 20% All 70%*

*More than 100% because some teachers mentioned more than one.

13. Is preparation time of lessons a problem in DLP?

Yes 75% No 25%

a) Do you spend more time preparing in DLP than was required prior to DLP program?

Yes 75% No 25%

14. Are the resource teachers helpful?

Yes 80% No 20%

15. Are the Educational Aides

Very useful 80% Useful 15% a Hindrance 5% ?

16. Has multi-age groupings produced any significant problems psychologically or sociologically of which you are aware?

Yes 0% No 100%

RESULTS OF THE TEACHER OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

The number of respondents to the Teacher Opinion Questionnaire was twenty-nine (29). For ease and interpretation all computed percentages are rounded to the nearest 5%. It should be understood that teachers were allowed to provide an open end response to each question. The investigator recorded their responses and later classified them. These classifications appear under each question.

As can be observed, the teacher's general reaction to the Directed Learning Program is favorable. Eight percent (80%) of the respondents had only minor reservations with respect to the program. The major reservations expressed dealt with the problem of movement. There was a small group of teachers who would like to maintain the general principle of DLP with each teacher working with behavorial objectives and with careful testing of competency and mastery of these objectives but within a self-contained classroom. The unfavorable responses to the DLP came from intermediate family teachers whose experience is limited in the program. Those teachers did not disagree with the philosophy underlying DLP but felt that their previous programs were as good and oriented toward the individual child. There were a number of first-year teachers in the sample. Some of these teachers had had experience with the self-contained non-DLP type of program in their student teaching experience. For a few, their only experience has been in DLP. It is interesting to note that the length of time in previous teaching prior to instituting DLP was positively related to the final two categories which were favorable with major reservations and unfavorable. The teachers with less prior experience seemed more favorable toward DLP than those teachers who had considerable experience prior to the instituting of the DLP.

The Competency Skill Sheets are arranged by levels and contain behavorial objectives. They reflect the minimal performance expected of each child.

Twenty (20%) percent of the teachers find these behavorial objectives very useful and twenty (20%) percent a hindrance. Those who consider it a hindrance were primarily utilizing basal reading programs and felt the behavorial objectives did not correlate well with the objectives expressed in the basal reading lessons. A majority of the teachers felt that the Skill Sheets were useful but with reservations. The primary reservations expressed were the lack of correlated material and the problem of record keeping.

Evaluation tests are utilized to test each child's mastery in the behavorial objectives of the level in which he is placed before moving him to the next level. These Evaluations Tests are fairly lengthy and contain more than one area of reading. It is possible for a child to pass a section of the Evaluation Test and move to the next level in that area, such as word recognition, and not successfully complete a section on comprehension, and remain at his previous level in that area. Unfortunately, fifty (50%) percent of the teachers consider these examinations to be a hindrance. The teachers who felt these tests were a hindrance mentioned these problems:

1. The length of time required to administer the test.
2. They can already predict the outcome of the test on the basis of the child's performance within the classroom.
3. Some children could not successfully meet the 80% criterion of the test, but were functioning satisfactorily in the area being measured within the group in the classroom.

Many of those who responded to question #3 by saying that the tests were useful with reservations expressed some of the same reservations of those teachers who considered it a hindrance. Only ten (10%) percent of the teachers find these Evaluation Tests to be very useful. Unfortunately, problems related to the fire in the senior high school have made it difficult to provide teachers

with all the materials they should have. As a result, not all teachers had received the Evaluation Tests and had an opportunity to use them.

Eighty (80%) percent of the teachers feel that there is good communication among the teachers concerning children in their home base who are being taught in language arts by another teacher. Weekly sessions are held in which the general problems of the family are discussed and in which there are opportunities for teachers to discuss individual children. There were a number of teachers who felt that the time allotted for this opportunity to communicate was insufficient, and the evaluator's personal observation is that communication is not as good as the teachers report it to be. In a few cases where teachers were asked about individual children who were in their home base but who were being instructed in reading by another teacher, the evaluator was referred to the other teacher to find out about the child's progress in reading. It is interesting to note that the reading records on a child are kept by the teacher who was instructing him the language arts period and not by his home base teacher. The evaluator feels that duplicate records should be made and that the Level Sheets containing the behavorial objectives should be given to the home base teacher as well as being kept by the language arts teacher.

The question of accountability is an important one. If children may be instructed by different family members, who bears the major responsibility for a child's reading progress? As can be observed, half of the teachers feel that the teacher who is instructing the child in reading, bears major responsibility for the child in that area, while forty (40%) percent of the teachers feel that the reading teacher and the home base teacher share that responsibility. It is interesting to note that in no case did anyone feel the entire family bore this responsibility. The evaluator's personal observation is that someone should be accountable for the total child, including his feelings, attitudes,

interests and reading achievement. The evaluator is not convinced that this sharing of the responsibility produces total accountability.

Record keeping on each individual child is very critical in the DLP. Thirty (30%) percent of the teachers felt that the amount of record keeping was not a burden. It is interesting to note that all of those teachers assigned this responsibility to the educational aide. All of the teachers who felt that the record keeping was a major burden, attempted to keep all the records themselves and seemed to utilize their aides less efficiently. Approximately half the teachers felt that the record keeping required was a minor burden which they were able to cope with. Many of those teachers spoke glowingly of the behavorial objectives and the DLP in general. They seemed to feel that although record keeping was a burden, it was a necessary one.

The inadequacy of physical facilities was noted by almost all the teachers. The classrooms in the Hempstead Public Schools are relatively small and contain practically no sound-deadening material. In an individualized program which involves many children engaged in different activities simultaneously, with the teacher and an aide at times working with small groups simultaneously -- and with an occasional student/teacher--the classroom can produce a considerable amount of noise. Some of the newer temporary classrooms with carpeting on the floors were rather large and seemed very quiet by comparison. The noise level in some of the classrooms was disturbing with a normal instructional program in progress. Those teachers who were satisfied with the physical facilities were often in these newer temporary classrooms, with one or two exceptions. Only half the teachers felt the physical facilities would be adequate for normal self-containing classrooms since they felt they would still group and utilize the same procedures they were utilizing in the DLP. The result would seem to indicate that teachers feel a minor improvement might be obtained by switching

to a self-contained classroom, but that their focus on individualized instruction would still make the physical facilities inadequate.

A majority of the teachers feel they do not have sufficient materials to work with. A particular inadequacy appears in the area of classroom library. Trade books are obviously not considered instructional materials and the budget to obtain such materials has been rather small. However, an individualized program requires that such materials be available. In addition, there is a general dearth of self-correcting and self-instructional material which help produce the kind of independence and responsibility for one's own individual progress that is such an essential part of individualized instruction. As has been mentioned earlier in the report, many children do not work well individually and too much activity is teacher-directed. In order to develop independence it is necessary that students be given the opportunity to initiate and follow through and correct their own work. There is still a dearth of such material. Those teachers who felt the materials were inadequate seem to rely primarily upon basal readers of which there seemed to be a plentiful supply. Multi-media materials are very necessary in an individualized program. They can provide instruction and direction when the teacher cannot be present. Some audiovisual materials arrived during the time that I was visiting classrooms so the forty (40%) percent of the teachers who indicate an improvement in this area are probably accurate. However, we still find that seventy (70%) percent of the teachers do not feel that the number of audiovisual aids and the material to be utilized with them, is as yet, adequate.

A vast majority of the teachers feel that time is efficiently utilized in the Directed Learning Program. Those who felt the time could not be efficiently utilized referred specifically to the limited opportunity to squeeze in five or ten minutes of instruction during the day. Since the children move at a particular time to their appointed teachers and return at specific times, they lose some flexibility during the school day. They feel they especially do not

have the opportunity to spend five or ten minutes with a child who requires this additional help, who is in another teacher's home base. The evaluator's personal observation is that there is some time wasted in movement from one classroom to another. If a teacher has completed an activity and it is only ten minutes until the next move will be made, she will very often fill in the time with a game or some other non-instructional procedure. Yet, most teachers do not consider movement to be a problem. As can be observed in Question #10, eighty (80%) percent of the teachers are satisfied with the present system of movement. It should be noted, however, that in some of the schools, children were maintained in a self-contained classroom for a period of time at the beginning of the year. In some of the schools the groupings were arranged in such a fashion that movement was kept to a minimum. The amount of movement observed within a family seemed to vary from one school to another. As can be additionally seen in Question #10, seventy (70%) percent of the teachers would prefer a self-contained classroom in which the range of individual differences is reduced. Many felt that homogeneous grouping produces difficulties for the one teacher who obtains the low group, but they would prefer a self-contained classroom if the groupings were arranged with one teacher having level 2-4-6, another 3-5-7, another 4-6-8. Question #11 seems to sum up the situation fairly well: seventy (70%) percent of the teachers feel that more accurate placement by levels and more individualization is possible in DLP than within a self-contained classroom. A few of the teachers who would prefer a self-contained classroom admitted that the flexibility of the DLP does have some benefit. A few of those who stated they would prefer a self-contained classroom, would have liked to maintain the option of moving one or two children to another classroom, if it were in the best interests of the child. Thus,

although there are a number of teachers who would prefer a self-contained classroom, they are not totally willing to lose the flexibility provided in the DLP. It would appear that some of them are asking for less movement and more opportunity to concern themselves with the total child and his achievement.

Teachers seem to be unable to agree on which children benefit most from DLP. Most have difficulty in choosing any specific group. As a result, the percentages in Question #12 are greater than 100% since a number of teachers mention more than one group. It is interesting to note that seventy (70%) of the teachers felt that all children benefit more from the Directed Learning Program; the next highest category being the superior reader. Teachers generally seem to feel that achievement this year is better than it has been in previous years and that the opportunity for children to progress at their own rates is very desirable. Many teachers report a lack of pressured feeling within the classroom and report that their students seem happier and more optimistic in outlook as well.

The difficulties inherent in the Directed Learning Program are quite evident in Question #13. A large number of teachers mentioned that the program required an inordinate amount of preparation on their part. About twenty (20%) percent of the teachers mentioned working on Saturdays and Sundays as well as late evenings to complete all the preparations required. Many felt that the school should provide some time for preparation because of the number required. As an example, teachers mentioned the necessity for preparing between three to five reading lessons, three to four mathematics lessons, and lessons in social studies and science. The evaluator feels there is some justification to these complaints, and if teachers are required to meet individual needs to an even greater degree than is presently the case, that there should be some allotment of preparation time during the school day. The effectiveness of the DLP in promoting individualization can be seen in the fact that seventy-five (75%) percent of the teachers spend more time preparing than they did prior to the instituting of the

program.

The resource teachers are viewed as helpful by eighty (80%) percent of the responding teachers. None of them seemed to feel threatened by the resource teacher who was viewed as an aid rather than a supervisor. Those teachers who did not consider the resource teacher helpful were older, experienced teachers who felt they had been teaching successfully for a long period of time and did not require assistance. It is likely in view of this attitude, that the resource teacher did not spend as much time assisting those with many years of experience. The educational aides were viewed as very useful by eighty (80%) percent of the teachers and an additional fifteen (15%) percent felt they were useful. This would appear to be a massive vote of confidence in the aide program. Ninety-five (95%) percent of the teachers felt the aide was of distinct benefit to them in implementing the DLP. Only five (5%) percent of the teachers felt that the aide was a hindrance. Unfortunately, the aides are not all receiving ongoing in-service instruction that would improve their usefulness. Many of the aides are pursuing further education on their own and will eventually become certified teachers. The evaluator's observations were that the aides were essential to the program, but that their lack of training prevented their being as useful as they could be. Some recommendations with respect to the training of aides will be made under the heading "Recommendations."

Children in the United States are primarily grouped by age. The old grade designations which refer to a specific level of achievement are rarely ever used. When one sees a grouping of children with the title "Second Grade," one normally observes a wide range of achievement within the classroom. However, one can be sure that most of the children in that class will be approximately seven years of age. Hence, the evaluator was very concerned with the effect of multi-age groupings in the primary and intermediate family. In many of the

families children range in age from six through eight at the primary level, and at the intermediate level, children range in age in a particular home base, from nine to eleven. The evaluator personally observed no difficulties caused by these multi-age groupings, and many of the teachers are not precisely aware of the exact age of a child. The children seem to have adjusted to the situation very well as indicated by the fact that none of the teachers have observed any problems which they felt were due to a multi-age grouping within the classroom. This is a surprising but pleasant observation.

TABLE III

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE OF RESOURCE TEACHERS

1. What are your functions in the DLP?

a) supplement teacher in classroom 100%
b) teach remedial groups during language arts lesson 80%
c) provide materials and encourage application 100%
d) help teacher develop lesson plans 80%
e) help teacher organize class for instruction 100%
f) evaluation of teacher-competency 0%
g) test all new children coming in 100%
h) assist in evaluation of pupil progress 100%
i) write prescriptions for child having problem 50%
j) demonstration lessons 100%
k) demonstrate materials 100%

2. What is your reaction to DLP?

Favorable 80% Favorable with minor reservations 10%
Favorable with major reservations 10% Unfavorable 0% .

a) How many years have you taught prior to instituting the DLP?

3. Do you find the Competency Skills Sheets given by levels

Very Useful 80% Useful with reservations 20% a Hindrance 0% ?

4. Do you find the Evaluation Tests to determine progress by level

Very Useful 80% Useful with reservations 20% a Hindrance 0% ?

5. How satisfactory is communication among teachers concerning children for whom more than one teacher share responsibilities?

Good 40% Fair 50% Poor 10% .

6. Who bears major responsibility for a child's reading progress?

Home Base Teacher 0% Reading Teacher 0% Entire Family 40%
Home Base Teacher and Reading Teacher Shared 60% .

7. Is record keeping on each individual child a problem?

No 95% Minor burden 5% Major burden 0% .

8. Are physical facilities adequate for DLP?

Yes 20% No 80%

a) Would physical facilities be adequate for normal self-contained classroom?

Yes 20% No 80%

Opinion Questionnaire of Resource Teachers (continued)

9. Are the materials you have to work with plentiful 10% adequate 40% inadequate 50% ?

   a) Do you have sufficient AV material to help individualize instruction?

   Yes 5% No 50% Improving 45%

10. Can time be efficiently utilized in DLP?

   Yes 90% No 10%

11. Is movement from one teacher's classroom to another a problem?

   Yes 5% No 95%

   a) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom heterogeneously grouped to DLP?

   Yes 5% No 95%

   b) Would you prefer a self-contained classroom homogeneously grouped to DLP in which range of individual differences is reduced?

   Yes 25% No 75%

12. Do you feel children's needs are met better through DLP than through grouping within a self-contained classroom?

   Yes 70% No 30%

13. Who do you feel benefits most from DLP?

   Superior reader 50% Average reader 0% Disadvantaged reader 10%
   Remedial reader ~~30%~~ All 60%.

14. Are the Educational Aides

   Very useful 100% Useful 0% a Hindrance 0% ?

15. Has multi-age groupings produced any significant problems psychologically or sociologically of which you are aware?

   Yes 0% No 100%

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE OF RESOURCE TEACHERS

In Question #1 the resource teachers were asked how they viewed their functions in the DLP. Their replies were recorded and listed under Question #1. As can be seen, responses a), c), e), g), h), j), and k) were given by all teachers. There seemed to be a general concurrence with respect to the functions of a resource teacher. Letter f) was placed in that grouping by the evaluator because it was surprising to note that a number of the resource teachers specifically excluded supervisory and evaluative functions with teachers. Most of the resource teachers felt that their rapport within the families would not be as great if they were to perform that function. Many of the resource teachers felt they would like to write prescriptions for the children having unusual or remedial problems, but that they are insufficiently trained to do so, and for those who felt their training was adequate, they had insufficient time. The resource teachers did express a desire to receive in-service training in the more advanced facets of diagnosis. In the area of demonstrating materials, many of the resource teachers mentioned their attempts to increase flexibility by demonstrating and using multi-media aids in the classroom. The teachers have been very interested and have increased their usage of audiovisual materials.

The resource teachers are all experienced teachers and as can be noted in Question #2, they have an extremely favorable reaction to the DLP. They find the behavorial objectives very useful, and feel the Competency Skill Sheets have helped many of the teachers pinpoint their efforts in teaching. The reservations expressed with respect to the behavorial objectives on a Competency Skill Sheet, dealt primarily with the lack of correlated materials. There is

an effort being made to develop materials that will be available to each teacher relating to each of the behavorial objectives on the level sheet. However, these have not yet been completed. Most of the resource teachers find the Evaluation Tests are very useful, and will help teachers in determining when children should be moved in level. Because of the dislocation in the generally cramped quarters caused by the fire in the senior high school last year, not all teachers have received the Evaluation Tests as yet. In the intermediate families, many of the children have not yet been tested for accurate placement. This is being done as quickly as materials become available.

The resource teachers are generally dissatisfied with the communication among teachers concerning children for whom they share responsibility. Fifty (50%) percent of the resource teachers felt that there was an insufficient time for conferences on specifics. Their once-a-week meetings were primarily devoted to general problems, and only occasionally to the problems of a specific child. In addition, the problem of a specific child may only be of interest to two or three of the teachers within a family. The resource teachers who felt that communication was fair would prefer seeing structured more time for the teachers to get together and work among themselves in small groups on specific problems of individual children. To some extent increasing a teacher's responsibilities to more children by movement was felt to lessen accountability. It is interesting to note that the resource teachers feel that the home base teacher and the reading teacher share responsibility for a child's reading progress, whereas fifty (50%) percent of the teachers felt that the teacher who had the child in the language arts period bore major responsibility. Some attention should be devoted to this problem of who is specifically accountable for a child's

reading growth.

It is interesting to note that the resource teachers do not consider record keeping to be a problem, whereas seventy (70%) percent of the classroom teachers consider it a minor or major burden. Many of the resource teachers felt that the record keeping could be handled very easily by an aide.

The resource teachers share the feeling of the classroom teachers with respect to the physical facilities. There has, of course, been some dislocation of classes caused by the fire at the senior high school, with one of the families utilizing the facilities at a church school. Nevertheless, the resource teachers feel that the classrooms are not sufficiently large or sound-proof for an individualized program. In addition to problems with facilities, the resource teachers shared a concern of the classroom teachers with respect to the available materials. Half of the resource teachers felt that the reading material available was inadequate for individualized instruction and that more audiovisual materials would help in this individualization of instruction. No major problems were observed with respect to time utilization in the DLP, and most of the resource teachers did not feel that movement between classrooms posed a major problem. Although none of the resource teachers are willing to give up increased individualization -- one-fourth of them did feel that a self-contained classroom with a reduced range of differences would be desirable.

A large majority of the resource teachers feel that DLP has made significant inroads in promoting individualization. Many of those who responded to question #12 with a "No," qualified their answer. These resource teachers felt that the teacher was still the prime variable and that the organizational plan was secondary. All of the resource teachers agreed that DLP has had slight effect upon very good teachers, but has had a very positive effect upon the

mediocre and new teacher. Hence, the resource teachers see DLP as benefitting teacher growth. In terms of the child's growth in reading, the resource teachers feel that all children benefit, but a number of the resource teachers felt that the children at the top end in reading achievement were no longer restricted and were allowed to move ahead at their own pace. Children requiring remedial work were in many cases taught by the resource teachers. It is interesting to note that most of the resource teachers do not use the level sheets or behavorial objectives in working with these children.

The resource teachers are unanimous in praise of the educational aides. They feel they are not only very useful in the classroom, but are almost essential to the proper functioning of a program such as the DLP. The general feeling among the resource teachers was that some aides were not as fully utilized as they could be by the classroom teacher with rare exceptions. They seemed to feel that good teachers had good aides. All of the resource teachers agreed with the observation that two to four week training periods prior to moving into the classroom as an educational aide is insufficient, and that some kind of ongoing program of instruction should be instituted.

The resource teachers and the classroom teachers within a family agree that multi-age groupings have not produced any significant problems; although some isolated discipline problems and conflicts have occurred, these seem no greater or more severe than have occurred in previous years when the classroom groupings were primarily by age.

Summary

Generally, the teachers react favorably to the Directed Learning Program despite the fact that they feel burdened with an excessive amount of preparation and record keeping; they seem willing to accept this burden because they feel the children are benefitting by the program. There are many variations within

the Directed Learning Program with some schools exchanging children between families when they feel this will be of benefit to the child, some schools where six-year-olds are kept in self-contained classrooms for a period of time before moving into the more flexible family-oriented arrangement of shifting children for language arts and mathematics, and some schools group homogeneously for reading, and either move no children at all or a very few children while there is movement for math. In addition, one of the schools has instituted a program strongly oriented toward the decoding skills in which there is some initial homogeneous grouping followed by later shifting throughout the family by levels. This program appeared to be very successful.

The level sheets composed of behavioral objectives seem to have given teachers a greater focus in clarifying reading goals and expectations. There are a number of teachers, however, who are having difficulties separating the goals and expectations that are expressed in the behavioral objectives on the level sheets with those of published basal reading material. The evaluator's general impression was that too many of the classroom teachers within the families were relying upon basal readers and the accompanying manual. There was little evidence of a strong free-reading program utilizing trade books with the prime goal of encouraging a lifetime interest and delight in reading. There, also, were a few isolated instances of teachers grouping the children by their appropriate levels for reading instruction, and then following this with a language arts instruction for the whole class.

Although the Evaluation Tests are designed to inform a teacher as to when a child has achieved sufficient mastery to move to the next level, it would appear that most teachers are capable of making this judgment on their own. Unfortunately the Evaluation Tests are lengthy and time-consuming unless some way can be found to have these tests administered by someone other than the

classroom teacher or her aide; it is unlikely that they will be used to any great extent. The evaluator agrees with the teacher that in their present form they are very time-consuming.

Teachers in a family suggest that they communicate fairly well with each other. In a few cases the evaluator questioned teachers with respect to children who were in their home base but who were being instructed in reading by another teacher. In all cases the evaluator was referred to the other teacher for the response. This suggests that communication is not as good as the teachers suggest. This type of response also reflects a problem in accountability. Although teachers claim they share the responsibility with language arts teachers for all children within their home base, this did not in fact appear to be true.

Although many of the teachers suggest that record keeping is a problem, much of the record keeping that was observed was rather sloppy and incomplete. In addition, for a program as complex as DLP, the record keeping was not always in the hands of those who needed it. At the risk of increasing the teacher's clerical burdens, the evaluator suggests that the teacher instructing the child in reading should have a record of the child's progress which should be xeroxed and given to the child's home base teacher. Thus, when she is working with the youngster in another area or has spare time within the home base periods, she could assist in helping to alleviate some children's difficulties. The evaluator's major disturbance is with the extreme emphasis upon teacher-direction. Children are not being trained to function independently and are rarely able to initiate their own activities. They also seem to have little understanding of the reading goals and expectations and little knowledge as to whether they

are achieving these goals. The behavioral objectives could be arranged in terms of charts or graphs with children keeping records of their own progress. Also, more effort should be made to utilize self-correcting materials, or to provide the children with keys so they may check their own work. If a program is to be truly individualized, it must rely upon the child and the teacher sharing the responsibility for the child's progress.

The physical facilities for the Directed Learning Program are poor. Unfortunately there is little likelihood of this being corrected in the near future. Classrooms are fairly small, and have no sound-deadening materials. As a result, an individualized program in which children initiate their own activities, seek the materials, do much of their own work and give it to the teacher or aide for checking, produces a very high noise level. The evaluator found the noise level, in many of the classrooms, disturbing. The only reasonable solution for this problem is an increase in temporary classrooms which are carpeted and which are larger than the permanent classrooms, carpeting the classrooms in the permanent buildings, and/or reducing class size.

This evaluator had an opportunity to visit the Hempstead Public Schools last year. The materials available for teachers were extremely meagre at that point. Although they would still be judged as less than adequate, there is a noticeable improvement over the preceding year. This improvement is evident in instructional materials and multi-media materials. However, last year's observation of grossly inadequate classroom libraries still stands. A central resource library from which teachers are able to order the books does not teach the children the use of a library nor does it give them the opportunity to browse among the large amounts of books. Classroom libraries should exist

within each classroom and there should be a large central library within each school. This may become feasible when the new high school is completed.

Movement of large groups of children seems somewhat wasteful. It would appear that as the DLP grows, and adequate records are available on each child, some reduced range heterogeneous classes could be organized that would cut down considerably on the movement. This would also improve accountability as teachers would be working with more of their own home base children in the area of language arts or in mathematics. A child's emotional needs cannot be coped with as well by a number of teachers to whom he has to adjust.

Recommendations:

1. There is a major need to provide materials correlated with the behavioral objectives contained in the level sheet. At the present moment, the needs are greater at the intermediate level than at the primary level, but teachers seem to be having difficulty in achieving the goals and expectations of the program. At the present time, goals and expectations appear to be too closely linked to published basal reading materials.

2. School libraries should be established within each building as soon as space becomes available. The materials which presently are housed in the resource library should be distributed among the schools. In purchasing books for the classroom libraries, it would be advisable to purchase paperback editions that are relatively inexpensive. Since cataloging is too time-consuming and costly with respect to the purchase price of these paperback books, they should simply be distributed to the classrooms for circulation among the students.

3. Although the teaching of reading within the families was not below average, teachers are still operating in a group-oriented fashion. Although

individualization to some extent exists by appropriate and accurate grouping, it does not exist in terms of differentiated assignments and differentiated teaching for each child. This goal cannot be accomplished without a massive in-service training effort. In-service courses should be offered to the resource teachers at a fairly high level in diagnosis and prescription. The classroom teachers possess some basic understanding of a good rudimentary reading lesson, but there were noticeable weaknesses. Most of the teachers seemed tied to basal reading manuals and workbook manuals and did not seem able to devise lessons on their own. For the level proficiency exhibited by these teachers, they would profit by some of the new Videotape courses which are available through the Macmillan Company. These videotaped courses provide the teacher with information and a model lesson taught by another teacher. The teacher then attempts to duplicate this and is allowed to evaluate her own performance. Under the leadership of an individual as capable as Mary Duane, this type of experience would prove beneficial for all of the classroom teachers. Another benefit of videotape is that it produces maximum flexibility as to when the materials may be offered and would allow for the possibility of small groups of teachers being relieved at a given time during the day for a viewing of the course materials. Hence, it might be possible to offer these courses within the structure of the school day. This type of inservice work and its results would be of general value, not only to Hempstead but to other suburban schools with similar populations. It might be possible to seek support for the research experimentation from the United States Office of Education or a private foundation. Funds may also be available for the implementation of such a course for educational aids. If the DLP is to be refined to a truly individualized

program, the need for trained aides is evident. It is possible that arrangements could be made with nearby academic institutions such as Nassau Community College, Hofstra University, and Adelphi University to arrange courses for the aides that would not only benefit classroom performance but which would also grant college credit. Many of the educational aides show high promise and any encouragement which helps them achieve the goal of becoming fully certified teachers will benefit the children in the Hempstead schools, the community, and the Hempstead School System.

4. The DLP should be continued but refined. More careful diagnosis of children is required and an increase in student-initiated activities. This would require the improvement of physical facilities and an improvement in materials. In particular, a vast infusion of new technological devices and the materials that accompany them will be necessary for this to be accomplished.

5. The educational aide program must be continued. A large number of groups with which a teacher is expected to work during the school day is impossible to accomplish by oneself. The addition of the educational aide has given a teacher far more flexibility within the class and has allowed far more individualization than would normally have been possible.

6. A reading specialist should be present in each school building, although some resource teachers now meet this qualification. Not all do. An individual is needed who is aware of the latest materials and methods available, who will disseminate these to the classroom teachers through the resource teachers. In only one of the schools were any significant innovations seen. It is interesting to note that a trained reading specialist is a resource teacher in that school. The reading consultant is to be commended for the extensive effort that has gone

into preparing the evaluation tests and the behavioral objectives. Mrs. Duane is an extremely effective individual who could be even more effective if she had a staff of reading specialists attached to each school who could assist her in general ongoing in-service work.

7. The school should consider the introduction of more innovative methods. There is considerable evidence from recently published research studies that methods and materials placing greater stress on learning sound-symbol relationships at the very beginning produce better results than basal materials not supplemented by a strong phonics program. In fact, one school has already instituted such a procedure. The results should be evaluated experimentally to determine whether this should be expanded to the DLP and the other elementary schools. Any new approaches instituted should be cast into a research framework. They should be used for several years and careful evaluation made of their effectiveness, not merely to determine whether it produces generally higher reading achievement than the prevailing methods and materials, but to determine the kinds of children who benefit from it most; the kinds of children who make average progress, and especially the kinds of children who still continue to fail. Further, it should be determined which kinds of teachers find it congenial and which do not.

8. The intermediate DLP seems more advanced this year than the primary DLP was at a similar time last year. However, greater flexibility is required at the intermediate level than at the primary level. It is absolutely essential that reading be cast into the framework of the content fields. The fusion of reading skill and the content fields is one of the primary goals at the intermediate level. All schools, not just some, should include science and/or social

studies within the language arts period. This will require considerable training of the teachers since it will be obviously necessary to differentiate assignments within science or social studies on the basis of one's knowledge of a child's level of reading performance.

In summary, DLP should not become another form of departmental instruction. To be truly effective it has to promote the concept of individualization and differentiation in teaching approach. This will require extensive in-service work, increased materials, improved physical facilities, greater use of techn logical aids, and increased development of student independence.

APPENDIX C

HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM

Mathematics Observer's Report

Dr. Claire M. Newman
May 18, 1971

This observer visited several of the Hempstead schools to follow up the observations and recommendations which were made in the interim report of January 18, 1971. The observer spoke with Lucius Williams (Mathematics Coordinator), Lawrence Roder (Assistant Superintendent), Messrs. Jenkins, Picozzi, and Tucker, principals of the Jackson, Marshall, and Franklin Schools respectively, and a number of learning directors and teachers.

A number of significant developments were observed. Others were revealed during discussions with the above-mentioned people.

Materials

1. Although it will take several years in the Directed Learning Program for teachers, classes,and schools to accumulate the varied materials which are needed, there is more on hand in many classes than was visible several months ago.

2. Principals have been taking advantage of publishers' consultation services to acquaint teachers with the materials which are available so that they can determine the best ways to fill their pupils' needs. In addition, members of the staff have attended professional meetings where they can learn about the availability of materials.

3. Some intermediate classes still seem to have little in the way of math materials. However, it must be noted again that this is their first year in the program and it will take time for such an accumulation to take place.

4. A list of math-related reading books has been sent to each school by Mr. Williams. It is hoped that individual classroom libraries will begin to include some of these books.

Physical Facilities and Class Organization

It is apparent that many things have been done to allow for more flexibility in the size of learning groups.

1. Where traffic and noise control permit, small groups meet in corridors.

2. In some instances, walls between classrooms have been removed so that two teachers and teaching assistants can work with their groups in a variety of ways.

3. In other cases, dividers are being used successfully within a single classroom.

4. Pupils moving into the new school in the Fall will free rooms for centers where large groups can meet. Unfortunately, this is not the case in all schools. Many will still be too crowded to permit such centers to be constructed.

5. The observer was advised that learning assistants will be assigned to families instead of to individual teachers. This, too, should allow for greater flexibility in the size of learning groups.

Inservice Education

1. Mr. Williams has been working with teachers in schools when his services have been requested. Furthermore, a workshop for new teachers is planned for the Fall. It is possible that, as the program continues, Mr. Williams will be given more latitude in offering his services when he deems it desirable to do so.

2. Some learning directors report that they are involved in helping their teachers with their understanding of mathematical concepts as well as the use of materials. At least one learning director is involved in demonstration teaching. It is possible that learning directors could benefit from some assistance with techniques for teaching and helping teachers.

3. The Mathematics Laboratory located at the Washington School is visited by teachers from various schools who are welcome to come and work with materials themselves.

4. It has been pointed out that teachers who are strong in math have been identified in each school and that these people are being used as resource personnel by those who need assistance. Intervisitation is taking place within the school district and teachers are visiting other districts as well.

5. With regard to grouping for instruction, it may be that teachers still need to learn which kinds of things can best be done in large groups, small groups, or individually.

6. Teachers still need to learn how to provide a variety of approaches, materials, and methods for remediation.

7. Learning assistants are meeting on a regular basis to work on some of the skills which they need.

Addendum to the Evaluation Report of the

Directed Learning Program in the Hempstead

Public Schools at the Primary & Intermediate Levels

Reading

At the request of Teaching & Learning Research Corp., appointments were made with a group of learning directors and administrators selected on a random basis from the families visited last fall. In addition, a random sample of classrooms were visited to determine the progress of DLP since last fall, and the extent to which recommendations made at that time have been implemented.

One of the more notable gains since the evaluation of the DLP in reading was accomplished last fall, is in the area of materials. Considerable effort has been made to provide material to correlate with the behavioral objectives outlined on the level sheets. Many of the new materials are self-correcting and to some extent self-instructional; freeing the teacher for greater concentration upon the needs of those children exhibiting problems. There has been a marked improvement in the use of tape recorders, listening centers, and some new video tape equipment. As a result, the classrooms appear to be busy with many centers of learning operating simultaneously. Children appear to be functioning with greater independence which is reflected in greater knowledge of expectations and ability to initiate a new activity when one has been completed. A number of teachers are utilizing a contractual plan in which they will work, and the methods and materials by which they can accomplish it. This procedure has vastly improved differentiation of instruction and is highly individualized in terms of student needs. The teachers seem much more aware of instructional materials and there appears to be a wider variety of materials being employed within the classrooms.

Within the classrooms there appears to be greater cooperation among students with older students taking the responsibility for assisting younger students. The educational aides seem to have a better concept of skills instruction and seem to be assisting very effectively with children having problems who require increased instructional time in review. The groupings within the classroom seem to be moving more toward a concept of skills development rather than difficulty levels. As a result, many of the classrooms seem more individualized and less group-oriented than they did in the fall. Reading specialists and learning directors seem to be working effectively with their families in helping with students exhibiting difficulty and in the dissemination of new material. The reading specialists, in particular, seem to be doing more than just remedial work, but consult within the classrooms in helping to implement programs which are innovative and in many cases appear to be effective. Some of the innovative decoding programs observed in the fall are being demonstrated so that all DLP teachers may observe its effectiveness. This should be an extreme aid in transmitting ideas and information on these new decoding techniques to all teachers. It would appear that the direction is to introduce a decoding emphasis program in the primary DLP throughout the district. This observer feels that that would be a major step forward.

In accord with the recommendation of last fall, the central library is being decentralized. Each of the schools within the district will receive a portion of those books and a library will be constructed within those schools that do not have one to contain them. This should improve self-selection and unstructured reading so that the goal of reading for pleasure may be attained more effectively. To encourage increased use of the library, a Library Youth Survey has been circulated from Mrs. Duane to all principals, reading teachers,

learning directors, and DLP teachers. This survey provides criteria that will enable the implementation of an effective literature and recreational reading strand as part of the total reading program. The survey itself will point out existing strengths and limitations in this area. Hence, the purpose of the survey is to do more than obtain information: it will enable the DLP teachers and responsible administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of this important part of the reading program.

In the coming year the sixth grade will become a part of the intermediate DLP. Preparation for this has involved visitation of sixth-grade teachers to the DLP and a one-month course planned for June on the procedures and expectations of DLP. Educational aides, for the coming year, will be pooled and used through all sixth grades so that no increase in educational aides will be necessary. This would appear to be an effective utilization of aides with teachers requesting an aide from the pool when an activity requires it. Hence, at the beginning of the school year, it would be expected that more educational aides would be assigned to the primary DLP because of the lack of independence of six-year-olds at the beginning of the year. The in-service course for aides, which is being instructed by Mrs. Barbara Harris, appears to be very effective, and enthusiastically received by the aides. The primary emphasis of this course appears to be skills-oriented and very pragmatic. For the coming year, an in-service course for all teachers in the DLP is planned. The primary emphasis on this course will be upon diagnosis, and then working in depth with the teachers within the classrooms in the implementation of the diagnostic information. Video tape equipment has already been used with some success this year as teachers have been encouraged to tape themselves in the class during

lessons and to observe themselves later so that they may observe their own strengths and weaknesses. The quantity of video tape equipment is insufficient to be used effectively through all of the schools in the area of teacher improvement. For in-service to be effective, a stable school staff is necessary. A high teacher turnover could destroy the effectiveness of any in-service program.

Teachers within families appear to be beginning to work with each other as a team more effectively. Nevertheless, communication with respect to specific children, could be improved and there still appears to be little attempt at duplicate record keeping so that the home base teacher and the teacher instructing a child in reading would have full information on the child's progress. The intermediate DLP has made tremendous progress since my observations last fall with particular improvement noted in integrating the teaching of reading within the content fields. The intermediate teachers seem to be getting away, to some extent, from basal readers and there has been an obvious improvement in multi-level materials and an infusion of trade books within the classroom. Increased individualization, marked improvement in the independence of students in initiating and following through in activities were both areas that were weak in last fall's evaluation and which have improved sufficiently to have almost reached the status of strengths in the spring.

In summary, the DLP seems to be getting away from departmental instruction and has made important strides toward promoting the concept of individualization and differentiation in teaching approach. The necessary in-service work, materials and technological aids required to accomplish these goals are in

process of improvement. The teacher-to-student ratio and the increased development observed in student independence augurs well for the continued development and improvement of the DLP. One cannot help but take a positive view toward the DLP program on the basis of the progress observed over such a brief period of time.

Harvey Alpert
Professor of Reading

APPENDIX D - ATTITUDINAL INSTRUMENTS

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer briefly:

1. What role did the community play in initiating and implementing the Directed Learning Program in the Hempstead School District?

2. List the specific efforts on the part of your office to create a bond of trust between the community and the school.

3. What special provisions have been made for teachers who are not as confident of their classroom effectiveness in an open classroom as opposed to the traditional classroom setting?

4. Describe briefly how the design of the organizational flow-chart has changed with the implementation of the DLP innovation.

5. Describe the role definition of the following individuals within the context of the DLP (nature of responsibilities):

a) Superintendent-

b) Principal-

c) Assistant Principal-

d) Learning Director-

e) Classroom Teacher-

f) Paraprofessional-

g) Reading Coordinator-

h) Mathematics Coordinator-

Indicate the degree to which the role has changed: NC (no change), MC (moderate change), or DC (decided change).

6. Are the role definitions and job descriptions uniform throughout the DLP?
YES_____NO_____ Is this a stated goal? YES_____NO_____
Comment.

7. Who is directly accountable for the quality of the learning experiences in the DLP. Please list in order of responsibility for the task.

   1. _____

   2. _____

   3. _____

8. Do the individuals have the authority and access to the necessary resources (consultants, classroom paraphernalia) to maximize learning-teaching experiences? YES_____NO_____Comment.

9. Please comment briefly on how you perceive the involvement of the paraprofessional in the learning-teaching process in the Hempstead School District:

   a) the ability and potential of the educational aide-

   b) the quality of the training program-

   c) the basic assumptions underlying the attitudes of the aide and the classroom teacher toward each other-

10. How would you rate the level and quality of communication between yourself and the following individuals?: (Use an X.)

    a) classroom teacher _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

    b) paraprofessionals _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

    c) learning directors _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

10.

d) principals _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

e) members of Board of Education _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

f) community in general _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

g) parents _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

h) curriculum coordinator:

1) reading _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

2) mathematics _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

We would like to know how you feel about the following statements. If you agree very much place the number one(1) next to the category in the space provided. If you agree some, put the number two(2); if you are undecided, put the number three(3); if you disagree some, put the number four(4); and if you disagree very much put the number five (5).
For example: 1. discrimination 2

Academic achievement is more a function of the following variables than lack of capacity to achieve:

1. discrimination_____

2. segregation_____

3. parental neglect_____

4. insensitive school environment_____

5. poverty_____

6. underachievement and the low educational levels of parents_____

7. feeling of lack of worth and poor self image_____

8. lack of cultural resources in the home_____

9. difficult home environment_____

10. lack of student motivation_____

1	2	3	4	5
I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much

11. lack of faith in the value of education_____

12. poor attendance_____

13. inadequate individualized instruction_____

14. lack of resource materials within the classroom_____

15. improperly trained teachers_____

16. inadequate pre-service and/or in-service training programs_____

17. level of parental interest in pupil achievement_____

TEACHING & LEARNING

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

April 1, 1971

Dear Parents,

The following questions are being asked as part of the on-going evaluation of the Directed Learning Program in your school system. The Teaching & Learning Research Corp. is seeking to discover and develop ways that school personnel can be more effectively assisted in continuously improving the education of children in the Directed Learning Program. Our chief focus will be in the important area of interpersonal relations. The information you provide here will be critically important to this effort. It will be analyzed by researchers, and the results will be returned to your school system where they may influence some changes. It is imperative that you feel completely free in your response to the questions. Your personal answers will remain anonymous and free of identification in any way. This insures the most objective evaluation possible.

1. Do you feel that the Directed Learning Program is definitely a step in the right direction? YES_____ NO_____

2. Did parents have adequate opportunities to assist in the development of the DLP? YES_____ NO_____

3. Are you satisfied with the way in which activities, problems, and policies of the DLP are communicated to the community? YES_____ NO_____

4. Are you an active participant in any community activities, committees, meetings, etc. that are related to school-community relations? YES____ NO____

   If the answer is YES, please list affiliations:

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

5. What features of the Directed Learning Program would you particularly like to see remain as a permanent feature of the DLP?

a._____ b._____ c._____

6. What features of the Directed Learning Program would you least like to see remain as permanent features of the DLP?

a._____ b._____ c._____

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

7. How would you rate your child's attitude toward the Directed Learning Program? _____Favorable_____Unfavorable_____Indifferent

8. If your personal attitude toward the Directed Learning Program is unfavorable, please indicate briefly your reasons for the unfavorable impression.

9. Academic achievement is more a function of the following variables rather than a lack of capacity to achieve. Please select an answer by using a number from 1 to 5.

1	2	3	4	5
I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much

1. discrimination_____
2. segregation_____
3. parental neglect_____
4. insensitive school environment_____
5. poverty_____
6. underachievement and the low educational levels of parents_____
7. feeling of worth and poor self-image_____
8. lack of cultural resources in the home_____
9. difficult home environment_____
10. lack of student motivation_____
11. lack of faith in value of education_____
12. poor attendance_____
13. inadequate individualized instruction_____

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

14. lack of adequate resource materials within the classroom_____

15. improperly trained teachers_____

16. inadequate pre-service, in-service training program_____

17. level of parental interest in pupil's achievement_____

10. Place the number from one to five (1-5) that best describes how you feel about the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5
I agree strongly	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree strongly

1. Every child should be reading on grade level or above, and efforts must be made to raise achievement levels in all other disciplines._____

2. Every child should be given a good foundation in the basic fundamentals._____

3. Minority groups should be included in textbooks and their contributions to American life and culture properly depicted._____

4. The child should be prepared for a good job and provided with skills that will enable him to climb the social ladder._____

5. Discipline and standards of behavior are equally as important as academic achievement._____

6. Teachers, educational aides, learning directors, and principals should take an active interest in community affairs and come to PTA meetings._____

7. The community should be more involved in educational planning and programs affecting the schools._____

8. The school should maintain an "open door" policy so that parents can visit with teachers, principals and others in charge of educational programs._____

9. Parents should be given an "action step"(one thing they can do at home) when talking with school officials about a student's progress._____

10. Parents should be involved with school personnel in planning a smooth transition into the Directed Learning Program for their children who are now in the upper grades in the Hempstead Public School System._____

11. The school curriculum should reflect news stories about the students' community._____

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

April 1, 1971

Dear Educational Aide,

The quality of the working relationship that develops between the professional and the educational aide is crucial to the objectives of an educational program and to their career development. Please indicate your objective evaluation of the relationship between professionals and educational aides in your school by completing the following questions.

1. Did you participate in a paraprofessional training program in preparation for your job before placement? YES_____ NO_____ LENGTH OF TIME_____. (days)
2. Dis the pre-service training program provide opportunities for a clear description of your role as a member of the teaching team? Comment.

3. Is enough attention given to meeting you academic and skill needs? YES_____ NO_____
4. Have you participated in joint sessions with classroom teachers for training in human relations and communication skills? YES_____ NO_____
5. Assuming that the role of paraprofessionals differ from school to school, what setting best describes your working situation today? Please circle the appropriate description or put an X on the line if your situation falls somewhere between two descriptions.

Teacher Dominated Model	Teacher Leader Model	Cooperative Model
-Teacher makes decisions, organizes leaders and plans learning experiences. Tells aide what to do with minimal explanation. -Teacher maintains control of classroom. -Aide assigned menial tasks only.	-Teacher maintains leadership role in subtle but observable ways; willing to communicate knowledge about children and education. Aide is also encouraged to make contributions to the discussion; teacher and aide have mutual respect for each other. Each learns from and teaches the other. Relationship based on mutual understanding and respect for each other's level of competence present.	-Clear definition of roles related to experience and training, commitment to team effort, deep respect for other's individuality. Accept common role as facilitator of learning. Realization that educational needs of children are best served by a team of people whose knowledge, experience, personalities complement each other's.

6. Where would you like to see the classroom teacher on the role continuum in the future? Use an X.

Teacher Dominated Model	Teacher Leader Model	Cooperative Model

cont'd...

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EDUCATIONAL AIDE QUESTIONNAIRE(cont'd)

7. How would you rate the level and quality of communication between you as a paraprofessional and the following individuals?: (Use an X)

a) classroom teacher _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

b) other paraprofessionals___Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

c) learning directors _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

d) principals _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

e) superintendent _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

f) members of Board of Education _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

g) community in gen. _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

h) parents _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

i) curriculum coordinator:

1. reading _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

2. mathematics _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

April 1, 1971

Dear Teachers,

The following questions are being asked as part of the on-going evaluation of the Directed Learning Program in your school system. The Teaching & Learning Research Corp. is seeking to discover and develop ways that school personnel can be more effectively assisted in continuously improving the education of children in the Directed Learning Program. Our chief focus will be in the important area of interpersonal relations. The information you provide here will be critically important to this effort. It will be analyzed by researchers, and the results will be returned to your school system where they may influence some changes. It is imperative that you feel completely free in your response to the questions. Your personal answers will remain anonymous and free of identification in any way. This insures the most objective evaluation possible.

We are particularly interested in your perception of how your students feel about classroom life. Below you will see five numbered categories. Please select the number of the category which describes best how you think the students in your class feel about each statement. Place the number next to the statement in the space provided.

1	2	3	4	5
Most students would agree very much.	Most students would agree some.	Most students would be undecided.	Most students would disagree some.	Most students would disagree very much.

1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities._____

2. Asking for help is a very good thing to do._____

3. Learning is fun most of the time._____

4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests._____

5. You should try hard to do your best._____

6. The teacher really wants me to learn my schoolwork as well as how to get along with other students._____

7. The teacher should try to find out how the students feel._____

cont'd....

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE(cont'd)

How do you feel about these things? Select the number of the appropriate category which describes best how you feel about each statement. Place this number next to the statement in the space provided.

1	2	3	4	5
I agree very much.	I agree some.	Undecided	I disagree some.	I disagree very much.

1. It is good to take part in all classroom activities._____

2. Asking for help is a very good thing to do._____

3. Learning is fun most of the time._____

4. It is all right to help others with school work except during tests._____

5. You should try hard to do your best._____

6. The teacher really wants students to learn their school work as well as how to get along with other students._____

7. The teacher should try to find out how the students feel._____

Your Classroom Group

Select the number of the category which tells best how you think the students in your class behave. Place the number next to the following statements in the space provided.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Almost Always	Often	Once in a While	Almost Never

The students in my class:

1. Are well mannered_____

2. Like doing schoolwork_____

3. Help one another with schoolwork_____

4. Take part in all classroom activities_____

5. Take care of themselves when left alone to work_____

6. Follow the teacher's directions_____

cont'd....

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Almost Always	Often	Once in a While	Almost Never

The students in my class:

7. Like being together_____
8. Work well together_____
9. Like the teacher_____
10. Like the educational aide_____
11. Share their feelings with the teacher_____
12. Disturb the class_____

Your students have been asked to indicate ways in which they would like to see their teacher change. Please select the number of the category that best describes how you think they would respond to the following statements. Place the number next to the statement in the space provided.

1	2	3	4	5
A lot more	A little more	No change	A little less	Much less

I wish my teacher would:

1. Let us decide what the class does_____
2. Make us do our work and behave ourselves_____
3. Let us know how we are doing_____
4. Care more about us_____
5. Find out how we feel about school and other things_____
6. Trust us by ourselves_____
7. Know the subject_____
8. Get to know my parents_____
9. Give me schoolwork to do at home_____
10. Explain our assignments and classwork_____

cont'd....

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

Paraprofessional - Professional Team

1. Please comment briefly on how you perceive the involvement of the paraprofessional in the learning-teaching process at your school.

   (a) The ability and potential of the aide -

   (b) The quality of the training program -

   (c) The basic assumptions underlying the attitudes of the aide and the professional toward each other -

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

Paraprofessional - Professional Team (cont'd)

2. Assuming that the involvement of paraprofessionals in educational programs are within the range on this continuum, where would you place yourself? Use an X.

Teacher Dominated Model	Teacher Leader Model	Cooperative Model
-Teacher makes decisions, organizes leaders and plans learning experiences. Tells aide what to do with minimal explanation. -Teacher maintains control of classroom. -Aide assigned menial tasks only.	-Relationship based on mutual understanding and respect for each other's level of competence present. -Teacher maintains leadership role in subtle but observable ways; willing to communicate knowledge about children and education; aide is also encouraged to make contributions to the discussion; teacher and aide have mutual respect for each other. Each learns from and teaches the other.	-Clear definition of roles related to experience and training, commitment to team effort, deep respect for other's individuality. Accept common roles as facilitator of learning. Realization that educational needs of children are best served by a team of people whose knowledge, experiences, personalities, complement each other's.

3. Where would you like to see yourself on the role continuum at a later date? Use an X.

_____a) Teacher Dominated Model

_____b) Teacher Leader Model

_____c) Cooperative Model

Level of Communication with Respect to Your Classroom Situation: How would you rate the level and quality of communication between you as a classroom teacher and the following individuals or groups. Use an X.

a. other classroom teachers ___Excellent ____Good _____Poor ____No Opportunity
b. educational aide ___Excellent ____Good _____Poor ____No Opportunity
c. learning director ___Excellent ____Good _____Poor ____No Opportunity

cont'd...

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM - HEMPSTEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

d. principal _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
e. superintendent _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
f. board members _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
g. community in gen._____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
h. parents _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
i. curriculum coordinator:
   1. reading _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity
   2. mathematics _____Excellent_____Good_____Poor_____No Opportunity

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM -- HEMPSTEAD SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

April 1, 1971

Dear Students,

We want to make schools a better place to learn and to work. In order to do this we need to know exactly how you feel about the Directed Learning Program. You do not have to give your names. No one will know who you are. We will add up the answers to each question so that we can tell you, your teachers, principal, and parents how students in general feel about the Directed Learning Program. This is one way to make schools a better place to learn and to work.

Try to answer each question with how you feel and how you think things are in your school. Your answers are very important to us.

Draw a line through the number which tells best how <u>you</u> <u>feel</u> about each statement.

Example:

	1	2	3	4	5
It is all right to throw paper on the floor.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much

If you <u>feel</u> that you disagree very much, you should draw a line through 5.

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much
2.	My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM -- HEMPSTEAD SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

		1	2	3	4	5
3.	Learning is fun most of the time.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much
4.	It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	You should try hard to do your very best.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My teacher really wants me to learn my school work as well as how to get along with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	1	2	3	4	5

How do you think your classmates feel about the same things? Draw a line through the number which tells best how you think <u>they feel</u> about each statement.

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM -- HEMPSTEAD SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

		1	2	3	4	5
2.	My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much
3.	Learning is fun most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	You should try hard to do your very best.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My teacher really wants me to learn my school work as well as how to get along with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	1	2	3	4	5

How do you think your teacher feels about the same things? Draw a line through the number which tells best how <u>you</u> think <u>your teacher feels</u> about each statement.

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	It is good to take part in all classroom activities.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much

		1	2	3	4	5
2.	My teacher wants me to ask for help when I need it.	I agree very much	I agree some	Undecided	I disagree some	I disagree very much
3.	Learning is fun most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	It is all right to help others with school work except during tests.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	You should try hard to do your very best.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My teacher really wants me to learn my school work as well as how to get along with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The teacher should try to find out how I feel.	1	2	3	4	5

One of the beautiful things about people is that we change. Draw a line through the number which tells best how you would like for your teacher to change.

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Let us decide what the class does.	A lot more	A little	No change	A little less	Much less

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM -- HEMPSTEAD SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

		1	2	3	4	5
2.	Make us do our work and behave ourselves.	A lot more	A little more	No change	A little less	Much less
3.	Let us know how we are doing.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Care more about us.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Find out how we feel about school and other things.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Trust us by ourselves.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Know the subject.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Get to know my parents.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Give me schoolwork to do at home.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Explain our assignments and classwork.	1	2	3	4	5

MY OWN CLASSROOM GROUP

Draw a line through the number which tells best how you think the students in your class behave.

DIRECTED LEARNING PROGRAM -- HEMPSTEAD SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

The students in my class:

	1 Always	2 Almost Always	3 Often	4 Once in a while	5 Almost never
1. Are well-mannered.					
2. Like doing school-work.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Help one another with schoolwork.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Take part in all classroom activities.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Take care of themselves when left to work alone.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Follow the teacher's directions	1	2	3	4	5
7. Like being together.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Work well together.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Like the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Like the educational aide who works with the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Tell the teacher how they feel.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Disturb the class.	1	2	3	4	5